AE2 Case Study Part 2 Marking Guide 2019							
Criteria		Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Proficient	Advanced	Highest Level	
Social Determinants of Indigenous Health	Discussion of how SDIH create social conditions for health inequity	No discussion is provided outlining how the SDIH create or contribute to broader health inequity. General SDH are identified and discussed, but social determinants of Indigenous health (covered in Weeks 3-7, inclusive), are not identified or discussed.	Some discussion is provided outlining how SDIH can create or contribute to health inequities. Discussion is descriptive rather than critical. Discussion of SDIH is general rather than specific to the assigned case study.	Discussion of SDIH demonstrates understanding of how they contribute to broader health inequities. Discussion demonstrates some criticality. SDIH discussed are mostly relevant to the assigned case study.	Critical discussion is provided exploring how SDIH can create or contribute to the conditions that produce health inequities. SDIH discussed are relevant to the assigned case study, drawing on examples from the case study sections provided.	In-depth, critical discussion is provided which demonstrates a well-developed and comprehensive understanding of how the SDIH create or contribute to current health inequities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Discussion is clearly relevant to the case study and draws on specific information provided in the case study sections.	
	Discussion of how SDIH impact on the individual in the case study	No discussion is provided outlining how the SDIH have impacted specifically on the individual in the case study. General SDH are identified and discussed, but social determinants of Indigenous health (covered in Weeks 3-7, inclusive), are not identified or discussed.	Social determinants of Indigenous health that impact on the individual in the case study are identified. Discussion is descriptive rather than critical. Discussion is not clearly relevant to the assigned case study, e.g. SDIH are not specific to the case study and are not discussed specifically in relation to the individual in the case study.	Some discussion is provided outlining the impact of SDIH on the individual in the case study. Discussion demonstrates some criticality. SDIH discussed are relevant to the assigned case study and/or draws on information provided in the case study sections to explore specific impact on the individual.	Critical discussion of the SDIH and their impact on the individual in the case study is provided. Discussion demonstrates some understanding of the complex interaction between the SDIH. All SDIH discussed are relevant to the case study and draw on specific examples from the case study sections to demonstrate how they have impacted the individual.	In-depth, critical discussion of the impact that the SDIH have had on the individual in the assigned case study. Demonstrates a well-developed understanding of the complex interaction between SDIH, and how they impact specifically on the individual. Discussion draws on the case study sections to provide specific examples of where and how the SDIH have created or contributed to the health condition.	

Critical reflection on learning	No critical reflection on learning is provided or demonstrates an insufficient attempt to reflect on learning.	A general description of learning is provided. The reflection is not based on the <i>Initial assessment</i> responses provided in AE1. The reflection is not written in first person.	A discussion of learning is provided which is clearly based on the responses provided in the <i>Initial assessment</i> section of AE1. The reflection is written in first person.	A discussion of learning is provided which demonstrates critical reflection on personal understanding of both the health issue(s) and role as a future health professional. The reflection is clearly linked to the responses provided in the <i>Initial assessment</i> section of AE1. The reflection is written in first person.	The discussion of learning demonstrates critical self-reflexivity, with consideration of own positioning and the impact this has on the understanding of health and provision of health care. The discussion is clearly linked to the case study and to the responses provided in the <i>Initial assessment</i> section of AE1. The reflection is written in first person.
Appropriate language	Inappropriate use of language and terminology.	Appropriate use of language and terminology, with some minor errors.	Appropriate use of language and terminology with no errors.	Use of language and terminology demonstrates a respectful and informed approach to discussing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health.	
Overall structure	Arguments are not constructed logically or lack coherence, making it difficult to discern overall meaning. Paragraphs are written as large sections of text, which could be broken into smaller paragraphs to improve readability.	Arguments could be linked more clearly and coherently but meaning is generally clear. Paragraphs are wellstructured but do not clearly linked to each other in a flowing argument. Could be more succinct	Arguments are coherent and meaning is clear. Well-structured paragraphs that link to the next, creating an overall flow to the discussion. Could be more succinct.	Arguments are presented in a logical and coherent structure, and meaning is clear. Paragraphs are well-structured and concise, and link to the next to provide a flowing discussion.	
Written communication	Information and ideas are not clearly communicated. Consistent spelling and grammatical errors that make it difficult to assess quality of the content.	Information and ideas are communicated well enough to convey basic meaning and understanding. Spelling and grammatical errors throughout	Information and ideas are communicated clearly. Minor spelling and grammatical errors.	Information and ideas are communicated clearly with no spelling or grammatical errors.	Information and ideas are expressed logically, coherently and succinctly. No spelling or grammatical errors.

Referencing	No or minimal in-text citations are used, and no reference list provided, OR a referencing style other than APA 6 th edition is used (e.g. Vancouver), OR there are substantial and consistent referencing errors throughout.	Minimal references are used; use of literature is limited to topic materials and/or use of inappropriate sources. APA 6 th edition is used consistently throughout. Errors in both in-text citations and the reference list. Some sections are not referenced.	An adequate number of references are used; includes some sources from the broader literature. Some inappropriate sources used. APA 6 th edition is used consistently throughout. Minor errors in referencing for in-text and/or reference list. All sections are referenced.	Discussion and critical reflection are well-referenced; includes a range of sources from the broader literature, including appropriate grey literature sources. APA 6 th edition is used consistently throughout. Minor errors in referencing for in-text and/or reference list.	Discussion and critical reflection are both well-references; includes a range of sources from the broader literature, including appropriate grey literature sources. Use of APA 6 th edition throughout, with no errors.
Deductions (if applicable)	General comments:				
Mark (/100)					
Grade					

Grading

Grading scales have been developed using the Flinders University Assessment Policy and Procedures grade descriptors, available at: http://www.flinders.edu.au/ppmanual/student/assessment-policy.cfm

Pass Level (P) – The grade will be awarded where there is evidence that a student has demonstrated at least an adequate level of knowledge/ understanding/ competencies/ skills required for meeting topic outcomes and satisfactorily completing essential assessment exercises.

Credit (CR) – The grade will be awarded where there is evidence that a student has demonstrated a sound level of knowledge/ understanding/ competencies/ skills required for meeting topic outcomes at a proficient standard.

The student would normally have attained a sound knowledge of matter contained in set texts or reading materials and have done wider reading and demonstrated familiarity with and the ability to apply a range of major academic debates, approaches, methodologies and conceptual tools.

Students should have a reasonable opportunity of reaching this grade provided they have completed all course requirements, demonstrated proficiency in the full range of course outcomes and shown considerable evidence of a sound capacity to work with the range of relevant subject matter.

Distinction (DN) – The grade will be awarded where there is evidence that a student has demonstrated advanced knowledge/ understanding/ competencies/ skills required for meeting topic outcomes and completing assessment exercises at a high standard.

The student would normally have attained an advanced and have demonstrated a broad familiarity with and facility at applying a range of major academic debates, approaches, methodologies and conceptual tools.

The grade should reflect very high quality work which shows the student generally works at a level which is beyond the requirements of the topic outcomes and is developing a capacity for original and creative thinking.

High Distinction (HD) – The grade will be awarded where there is evidence that a student demonstrated the acquisition of an advanced level of knowledge/understanding/competencies/skills required for meeting topic outcomes and passing the range of topic elements at the highest level. The student would normally have attained an in-depth knowledge of and have consistently demonstrated a high level of proficiency at applying a range of major academic debates, approaches, methodologies and conceptual tools and combining knowledge of the subject matter of the topic with original and creative thinking. The grade will be awarded in recognition of the highest level of academic achievement expected of a student at a given topic level.

Fail (F) – The grade will be awarded if a student is unable to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance in the topic or has failed to complete essential topic elements or required assessment exercises at an acceptable level, in accordance with topic outcomes.