



Collaborative Enhancement Project 2022/2023



Optionality in Assessment: Case Studies

Case Study 2

Author: Nicole Brown

Institution: University College London

Discipline/Field of Study: Interdisciplinary module entitled "Disability, Chronic illness and Neurodivergence in Contemporary Society"

Type of Assessment: Artefact plus critical commentary. Students choose their artefact and they choose to submit the critical commentary as a written essay or recorded presentation.

Level: 5 & 6

Credits: 15

Unit Type: Optional unit available across a range of programmes

Type of Optionality: Submission format: written or recorded presentation and negotiated assessment task/question

Assessment Details:

This is a case study for the assignment of the Disability, chronic illness and neurodivergence in the contemporary society module. Students are asked to create an artefact and a critical commentary. Students can choose the exact assessment topic for the artefact and commentary as well as the submission format, which is an artefact of any kind plus either a written essay or a recorded presentation.

The assessment is for Level 5 and Level 6, so students at both levels do the same assessment, but have different assessment criteria to account for the Year 2 and Year 3 studies.

a. Instructions for completing the assessment

Artefact and critical commentary

What is the task?

The overall task is to engage with representation and models of disability, and how different disciplinary or theoretical lenses shape understanding of disabilities, chronic illnesses and/or neurodivergence.

What do I have to do?

For this assignment you are required to...

...create an artefact that represents a concept or experience explored in the module

...justify, explain and - using relevant literature - critically explore your artefact in the commentary

...evaluate the strengths, benefits as well as challenges and limitations of the artefact and your chosen viewpoint.

What does an "artefact" look like?

An artefact can be anything you would like it to be. For some people, this may be curated objects; for others, this may be a collage, painting, drawing, sketch or photograph; for others, still, this may be a poem, fictionalised account, autoethnographic extract; for others, this may be something you have baked, or something you have sewn or knitted. You can be as creative as you would like with this.

How do you judge the quality of the artefact?

We are not looking at the aesthetics of an artefact. If you are drawing a circle, and it is a wonky circle instead of a beautifully drawn one, that does not matter, as long as you are able to explain in your commentary what you are trying to achieve. Maybe the wonky circle is wonky for a reason? Maybe not? The quality of the artefact really hinges on the quality of the commentary.

What is the exact title of the assignment?

There is not one exact title. You may want to use two titles - one for your artefact, and another for the commentary. You have the freedom to create a title for your artefact and your commentary.

What is the purpose of the critical commentary?

The critical commentary is your opportunity to engage with the module concepts and readings and any other readings that go beyond the module but are related to Disabilities, Chronic Illnesses and Neurodivergence in Contemporary Society. The critical commentary is your opportunity to critically explore your artefact and to evaluate the strengths, benefits as well as challenges and limitations of the artefact and your chosen viewpoint.

How long is the critical commentary?

2000 words +/- 10%. or 10 mins pre-recorded presentation

b. Marking rubric

Level 5

Assessment criteria: Artefact and critical commentary

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3 rd (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	1 st (A)	1 st (A)
Knowledge and Understanding	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of models of disability. Significant inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and only superficial understanding of models of disability. Some inaccuracies.	Some knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Broad knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Very good knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Very good, detailed understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Some beginning awareness of the limitation of their knowledge and how this influences on analysis and interpretations.	Exceptional understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the limitation of their knowledge and how this influences on analysis and interpretations.
Intellectual skills <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; using evidence; drawing conclusions</i>	Unsubstantiated generalizations made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of analysis and relevance.	Generalisations and statements are largely irrelevant, illogical or contradictory. Conclusions lack relevance and/or validity.	Some awareness of main issues and beginning identification of an argument. Some evidence provided but not always consistent. Some relevant conclusions.	Main issues identified and critically analysed. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence. Generally sound conclusions.	Good level of analysis and synthesis. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence convincingly. Valid conclusions.	Excellent analysis and synthesis. A range of perceptive points made. Evidence used convincingly to build logical argument. Strong conclusions.	Exceptional analysis and synthesis. Perceptive, logically connected points made throughout the proposal. Evidence selected judiciously to build eloquent, balanced argument. Persuasive conclusions.
Scholarly practices <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and</i>	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading appropriate for this level and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used	Evidence of reading relevant sources with some appropriate linking to given texts. Academic conventions evident and largely	Knowledge and analysis of a range of literature beyond core texts. Literature used accurately and analytically. Academic	Knowledge of the field of literature used consistently. Research-informed literature integrated into the work. Very good use of	Critical engagement with a range of reading. Knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in	Exceptionally wide range of relevant literature evaluated and used critically to inform argument, and balance discussion.
Research and enquiry <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; methods for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience</i>	Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.	Limited evidence of skills of research and enquiry in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident.	Research skills: some evidence of ability to collect and interpret appropriate information and create an artefact (with commentary) with limited external guidance. Can communicate findings appropriate to the discipline, but with some weaknesses.	Research skills: Can and create an artefact (with commentary) drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can communicate effectively and largely appropriate to the discipline and audience.	Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary), drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can communicate effectively and consistently, appropriate to the discipline and audience.	Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary) with a significant degree of autonomy. Can communicate very effectively and confidently, appropriate to the discipline and different audiences.	Evidence of exceptional success in creating an artefact (with commentary) with a high degree of autonomy for the level. Can communicate highly effectively and confidently with diverse audiences, in a wide range of formats, as appropriate to the context.
Professional and life skills <i>e.g. creativity, digital practices; presentation skills; ethical awareness; team working; self-management; project and time-management; leadership; recognition of own strengths and weaknesses and ability to take steps to improve.</i>	Little no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.	Limited evidence of ability in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident in key areas, including ethics of artefact creation.	Some evidence of ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, but with limited insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.	Good ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, showing good insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.	Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills identified by others and develop and effectively apply own evaluation criteria.	Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills showing excellent judgement, including of the ethical responsibilities of the task.	Outstanding evidence of ability to show insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses, showing outstanding judgement and awareness of complexity of ethical issues in task.
Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100

Level 6

Assessment criteria: Artefact and critical commentary

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3rd (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	1st (A)	1st (A)
Knowledge and Understanding	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of models of disability. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and only superficial understanding of models of disability. Some significant inaccuracies.	Understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; beginning interdisciplinary knowledge in part informed by research	Systematic understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; coherent interdisciplinary knowledge in part informed by research	Good understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; coherent interdisciplinary knowledge informed by range of research	Excellent interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base	Highly detailed interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge
Intellectual skills <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; using evidence; drawing conclusions</i>	Unsubstantiated generalizations made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of analysis and relevance. Unsupportable or missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate.	Some evidence of analytical, intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalised statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings and views, but not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse and/or abstract information without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions.	Sound logical, analytical thinking, synthesis and evaluation. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments and to review the significance of evidence. Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions.	Thoroughly logical work supported by judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. High quality analysis. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong conclusions.	Exceptional work- Judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Highly persuasive conclusions.
Scholarly practices <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	Little evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used inconsistently.	References to a range of relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Academic conventions evident and largely consistent with minor lapses.	Knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature including sources retrieved, analysed independently. Academic skills consistently applied.	Knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature including sources retrieved, analysed independently with accuracy and assurance. Good academic skills consistently applied.	Excellent knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently applied.	Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently and professionally applied.
Research and enquiry <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; methods for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience</i>	Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.	Limited evidence of skills of research and enquiry in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident.	Research skills: Can competently create an artefact (with commentary) with minimum guidance with minor weaknesses. Can communicate findings in different formats as appropriate to the task, with limited weaknesses.	Research skills: Can competently create an artefact (with commentary) with minimum guidance. Can communicate effectively in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register appropriate for audience.	Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary) including evaluation with very limited external guidance. Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register to engage audience.	Research skills: Can very successfully create an artefact (with commentary) including evaluation with a significant degree of autonomy. Can communicate professionally and confidently in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register to engage audiences.	Impressive ability to draw on own research and that of others to formulate meaningful argument for artefact and commentary. Exceptionally successful in a wide range of tasks including evaluation with a high degree of autonomy. Can communicate with real professionalism, adapting style easily for given audiences.
Professional and life skills <i>e.g. creativity, digital practices,; presentation skills; ethical awareness; team working; self-management; project and time-management; leadership; recognition of own strengths and weaknesses and ability to take steps to improve.</i>	Little no evidence of the required skills.	Limited evidence of ability in the range of skills identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident.	Some evidence of ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, but with limited insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.	Good ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, showing good insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.	Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills identified by others and develop and effectively apply own evaluation criteria.	Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills showing excellent judgement, including of the ethical responsibilities of the task.	Outstanding evidence of ability to show insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses, showing outstanding judgement and awareness of complexity of ethical issues in task.
Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100

c. Teaching materials

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: an overview. *Historical social research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 273-290.

Spry, T. (2018). Autoethnography and the other: Performative embodiment and a bid for utopia. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 627-649.

Snyder, S. L., & Mitchell, D. T. (2008). "How do we get all these Disabilities in here?": Disability Film Festivals and the Politics of Atypicality. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, 17(1), 11-29.

Langton, M. (1994). Aboriginal art and film: The politics of representation. *Race & class*, 35(4), 89-106.

d. Other links or pertinent information

UCL Micro CPD:

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/case-studies/2022/dec/assessments-letting-students-choose>

Digital Assessment at UCL:

<https://reflect.ucl.ac.uk/digital-assessment/2023/01/09/letting-students-decide-on-their-assessments/>

Chapter: Assessments: letting students decide.

Brown, N., Morea-Ghergu, D. & Onwuka, N. (2020). Assessments: letting students decide. In:

Mawani, S., & Mukadam, A. (eds). *Student Empowerment in Higher Education: Reflecting on*

Teaching Practice and Learner Engagement. Vol. 2. Berlin: Logos Verlag. 487-498.

<https://www.nicole-brown.co.uk/assessments/>