

## **Assessment Form**

## **Assessment Form – Written Reflection Using Epistemic Recontextualisation**

$O_{1}$		1		me:
->TI	ICIE	nt	na	me:
-u	JUL	,	пu	ıııc.

Assessor:

Date:

Criteria	Level 3: Strong	Level 2: Sufficient	Level 1: Needs Development
1. Reflexive Exposure Describes immediate reactions to the selected material.	Clear and honest description of personal reactions, showing openness and depth.	Adequate description of reactions, but somewhat limited or general.	Superficial or vague description; reactions unclear or missing.
2. Self-analysis Analyses beliefs, assumptions, and emotions behind the response.	Connects reactions to underlying beliefs and values with insight and nuance.	Identifies beliefs/emotions with some clarity, though reflection may lack depth.	Lacks self-awareness; analysis is absent or shallow.
3. Epistemic Criteria Identifies personal standards for evaluating knowledge.	Clearly identifies and reflects on relevant epistemic criteria.	Mentions at least one relevant criterion with some explanation.	Criteria are unclear, missing or misunderstood.
<b>4. Recontextualisation</b> Applies a strategy to shift interpretation.	Effectively applies a strategy and explains how it changes understanding.	Attempts recontextualisation with some reflection on the outcome.	Strategy unclear or missing; no meaningful shift in perspective.
5. Epistemic Virtues Reflects on the role of virtues like openness and modesty.	Thoughtful reflection on how virtues shaped or could shape interpretation.	Basic mention of virtues with limited connection to learning.	No meaningful engagement with epistemic virtues.
6. Overall Coherence Clarity, structure and flow of the reflection.	Clear structure, logical flow and accessible writing throughout.	Mostly clear and structured, with minor issues.	Disorganised, hard to follow or lacking in clarity.



## Comments / Feedback

Comments / Feedback
Strengths:
Suggestions for improvement:
Overall impression/grade (if applicable):