

## PUN210 Assessment 2 Marking Rubric

Criteria	<b>7 High Distinction 85–100%</b>	<b>6 Distinction 75–84%</b>	<b>5 Credit 65–74%</b>	<b>4 Pass 50–64%</b>	<b>3 Marginal F 40–49%</b>	<b>2 Fail 25–39%</b>	<b>1 Low Fail &lt;25%</b>
<p><b>Demonstrated understanding of the regulatory, contemporary, risks, benefits, clinical factors, operational, financial, governance and HR issues involved in introducing this new technology in health care, and the ability to apply robust discussion.</b></p> <p>(36%)</p>	<p>Evidence of a thorough analysis of factors involved in the introduction of new health technology in the quoted environment. Informed and supported by literature, well evidenced and articulately and convincingly discussed. Use of frameworks and mechanisms of review in risks and benefits.</p>	<p>Evidence of a good understanding of all factors involved in the introduction of new health technology in the quoted environment. Informed and supported by literature and generally discussed. Use of frame works of use in risks and benefits.</p>	<p>Evidence of a sound understanding of most of the factors involved in the introduction of this new health technology in healthcare, informed by the literature. A discussion from the literature in risks and benefits.</p>	<p>Evidence of a satisfactory understanding of some of the factors involved in the introduction of this new health technology in healthcare, informed by the literature.</p>	<p>Limited understanding or consideration of the factors involved in the introduction of new health technology in healthcare.</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated understanding or consideration of the factors involved in the introduction of new health technology in healthcare.</p>	<p>Work provides little or no evidence of learning in relation to this criterion,</p>

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Recommendation made to management in concise, clear and evaluative terminology, utilising and presenting pertinent options, information and outcomes.</b></p> <p>(16%)</p>	<p>Detailed recommendation that underscores a comprehensive and critical analysis of the benefits and risks (with acts in mitigation of the latter) on this new technology. Key arguments supported with examples from relevant case studies and supported by the literature.</p>	<p>Clear recommendation supported by a description and evaluation of the benefits and risks associated with introducing new technology evident in a well-considered response with support from the literature.</p>	<p>Many of the key issues from the business case are identified in the recommendation to management and evidence is given to support opinions provided.</p>	<p>Some of the key issues are identified in the recommendation to management. Some factors in the consideration are used in the recommendation and evidence is given to support opinions provided.</p>	<p>Incomplete/limited recommendation to management. Incomplete description of benefits and risks and other factors associated with introducing new technology with limited reference evidence in support.</p>	<p>No/inadequate recommendation to management. No/inadequate description of benefits and risks or other factors associated with introducing new technology.</p>	<p>Work provides little or no evidence of learning in relation to this criterion.</p>

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Inclusion of a brief change management process that you would use to introduce and commence operations with the new technology including communication to the stakeholders.</b></p> <p>(16%)</p>	<p>All key terms, findings and concepts in change management are clearly defined and explained with support from theoretical change models. Communication is addressed within a change management framework which identifies all stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>All key terms, findings and concepts are defined and explained in a change management plan with support from change management methodologies.</p>	<p>Key terms, findings and concepts are clearly defined and explained to in respect to most aspects of change management and communication.</p>	<p>Some key terms, findings and concepts in change management are defined and explained in a general change manage discussion.</p>	<p>Key terms, findings and concepts are poorly defined and explained regarding both change and communication.</p>	<p>No /limited evidence of communication of key terms, findings and concepts regarding change, communication and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Work provides little or no evidence of learning in relation to this criterion.</p>

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Organisation, structure and written presentation: clear, logical and evident structure for the organisation and presentation of the information in the paper. Demonstrates acceptable standards of written work.</b></p> <p>(16%)</p>	<p>The paper is well-organised with a logical, clear, evident structure and progression of ideas/argument.</p> <p>Carefully edited with no errors.</p> <p>Accurate referencing and appropriate length.</p>	<p>The paper is appropriately organised with a logical structure.</p> <p>Carefully edited with few errors.</p> <p>Accurate referencing and appropriate length.</p>	<p>The paper shows evidence of acceptable organisation and structure.</p> <p>Well-edited but with some errors that may hinder readability.</p> <p>Appropriate referencing and length.</p>	<p>The paper has a satisfactory structure with mostly logical presentation.</p> <p>Satisfactory editing, but with a few errors that may hinder readability.</p> <p>Appropriate referencing and length.</p>	<p>The paper is poorly organised and lacks clear structure.</p> <p>Errors that hinder readability.</p> <p>Referencing incomplete or inappropriate.</p> <p>Length too long or too short.</p>	<p>The paper is disorganised with no clear structure.</p> <p>Multiple errors hinder readability.</p> <p>Referencing incomplete and/or inappropriate.</p> <p>Length – too long or too short.</p>	<p>Work provides little or no evidence of learning in relation to this criterion.</p>

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Use of literature: Quality of and use of supporting literature and references.</b></p> <p>(16%)</p>	<p>Excellent use of a wide variety of academically appropriate literature.</p> <p>References used in an integrated manner that substantiates the assertions.</p>	<p>Very good use of academically appropriate literature.</p> <p>References used appropriately to support assertions.</p>	<p>Good use of literature to support discussion and assertions.</p>	<p>Adequate use of literature to support discussion and assertions</p>	<p>Limited use of literature to support discussion and assertions.</p>	<p>Poor or no use of literature to support discussion and assertions.</p>	<p>Work provides little or no evidence of learning in relation to this criterion.</p>