B-PAP.1 Case Report 1 ONLY

CRITERIA	% WEIGHTING
Case details communicated clearly and logically	15%
Case management and clinical reasoning process	30%
Demonstration of critical reflection centred on evidence-based medicine (EBVM)	30%
Quality of EBVM and appropriate use of references	10%
Overall attention to case report technique and construction including: scientific language and terminology, referencing format, spelling and grammar, structure & layout	5%
Concise writing style and adherence to expected word count	10%

Case details communicated clearly, concisely and logically						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Little or no	Not clearly or	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very good	Excellent
attention to	logically presented;	communication of	communication of	communication of	communication	communication of
communicatio	and/or	the main facts of	the main facts of	the main facts of	of the main facts	the main facts of
n of the	details of the	the case. Some	the case including	the case including	of the case	the case including
pertinent	population	details of the	the population	the population	including the	the population
aspects of the	group(s), approach	population	group(s), approach	group(s), approach	population	group(s), approach
case.	to evaluation of	group(s), approach	to evaluation of	to evaluation of	group(s),	to evaluation of
	ration and feed &	to evaluation of	ration and feed &	ration and feed &	approach to	ration and feed &
	water delivery, and	ration and feed &	water delivery, and	water delivery,	evaluation of	water delivery,
	relevant factors in	water delivery, and	relevant factors in	and relevant	ration and feed	and relevant
	herd/flock	relevant factors in	herd/flock	factors in	& water delivery,	factors in
	management	herd/flock	management.	herd/flock	and relevant	herd/flock
	omitted/disordere	management	Information	management.	factors in	management.
	d/ illogical.	omitted or not well	presented less	Good ability to	herd/flock	Excellent ability to
		ordered/illogical.	logically.	present	management.	present
					Very good ability	information

				information logically.	to present information logically.	logically.		
Case manageme	Case management and clinical reasoning process							
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)		
Approach to	Poor approach to	Inadequate	Adequate	Good approach to	Very good	Excellent approach		
the case and	the case. Decision	approach to the	approach	the case, outlining	approach to the	to the case,		
clinical	making processes	case. Decision	to the case,	and justifying	case, outlining	outlining and		
reasoning and	poorly justified	making processes	outlining and	decision making	and justifying	justifying decision		
observation	and/or outlined.	not well justified	justifying decision	processes	decision making	making processes		
absent or	Omissions or short	and/or outlined.	making processes	(including	processes	(including selecting		
unsuitable.	cuts in approach	Some omissions or	(including selecting	selecting suitable	(including	suitable data and		
	and appraisal not	short cuts in	suitable data and	data and	selecting suitable	information to		
	identified and/or	selecting suitable	information to	information to	data and	base appraisal on),		
	not justified in the	data and	base appraisal on),	base appraisal on),	information to	incorporating		
	light of factors	information to	incorporating	incorporating	base appraisal	factors associated		
	associated with the	base appraisal on,	factors associated	factors associated	on),	with the specific		
	specific population	and/or not	with the specific	with the specific	incorporating	population group		
	group and	adequately	population group	population group	factors	and flock/herd, its		
	flock/herd, its	justified in the light	and flock/herd, its	and flock/herd, its	associated with	owner, available		
	owner, available	of factors	owner, available	owner, available	the specific	equipment and		
	equipment and	associated with the	equipment and facilities and your	equipment and	population group	facilities and your		
	facilities and your	specific population group and	own professional	facilities and your	and flock/herd,	own professional		
	own professional	flock/herd, its	experience.	own professional	its owner, available	experience. Excellent		
	experience. Poor or absent	owner, available	Adequate	experience. Good translation	equipment and	translation of		
	translation of	equipment and	translation of	of reasoning and	facilities and	reasoning and		
	reasoning and	facilities and your	reasoning and	observation into	your own	observation into		
	observation into	own professional	observation into	appraisal and	professional	appraisal and		
	appraisal and	experience.	appraisal and	conclusion.	experience.	conclusion.		
	conclusion.	Inadequate	conclusion.	CONCIUSION.	Very good	55.1514515111		
	2311010010111	translation of			translation of			
		reasoning and			reasoning and			

Demonstration of Very Poor (0%) No attempt to include critical reflection or use evidence-based medicine in discussion of the case.	Poor (20%) Poor ability to critically reflect on the case. Poor ability to recognise factors in clinical observation and population group or flock/herd management, or other factors relevant to the topic and questions posed that required reflection. Poor ability to review the relevant	observation into appraisal and conclusion. tred on evidence-based Inadequate (40%) Inadequate ability to critically reflect on the case. Inadequate ability to recognise relevant factors in clinical observation and population group or flock/herd management, or other factors relevant to the topic and questions posed that required reflection. Inadequate ability	medicine (EBVM) Adequate (50%) Adequate ability to critically reflect on the case, having reviewed the literature and considered most of the population group, flock/herd and client factors. Good use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence to justify statements and critical review of the flock/herd management.	Good (65%) Good ability to reflect on the case critically, having reviewed the literature and considered almost all of the population group, flock/herd and client factors. Good use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence to justify statements and critical review of the flock/herd	observation into appraisal and conclusion. Very Good (80%) Very good ability to critically reflect on the case, having reviewed the literature and considered all of the population group, flock/herd and client factors. Very good use of the available clinical and/or literature evidence to	Excellent (100%) Excellent ability to critically reflect on the case, including aspects of observations, management or other factors relevant to the topic and questions posed having reviewed the literature and considered all of the population group, flock /herd and client factors. Excellent use of the		
	reflection. Poor ability to	posed that required reflection.	critical review of the flock/herd	statements and critical review of	clinical and/or literature	group, flock /herd and client factors.		
	on the case.	and/or literature evidence to reflect on the case.			management.	critical review of the flock/herd management.		
	Quality of EBVM and appropriate use of references							
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)		
No references cited	Few but poor quality	Some references cited but either not	Resources generally relevant to the task; some	Good quality sources used, recent and seminal	Very good quality sources used; recent,	Excellent quality of references used, recent and seminal		

	resources cited such as Wikipedia or references from questionable secondary or tertiary sources.	relevant to the task or poor quality	resources not of high quality where more suitable references are available (Use of secondary sources/ book chapters etc. where primary sources would have been preferable)	articles mostly relevant to task	seminal and peer reviewed almost always relevant to task.	peer-reviewed literature highly relevant to task.
Overall attention	to case report techniq	ue and construction				
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Very little	Poor overall	Inadequate overall	Adequate overall	Good overall	Very good	Excellent over
overall	attention to detail	attention to detail	attention to detail	attention to detail	overall	attention to detail
attention to	and construction,	and construction,	and construction	and construction	attention to	and construction
detail and	e.g. poor use of	e.g. in use of	e.g. in use of	e.g. in use of	detail and	e.g. in use of
construction,	correct and precise	correct and precise	correct and precise	correct and precise	construction	correct and precise
e.g. very poor	terminology when	terminology when	terminology when	terminology when	e.g. in use of	terminology when
attention to	describing	describing	describing	describing	correct and	describing
detail in	husbandry, clinical	husbandry, clinical	husbandry, clinical	husbandry, clinical	precise	husbandry, clinical
terminology,	findings,	findings,	findings,	findings,	terminology	findings,
language,	anatomical	anatomical	anatomical	anatomical	when	anatomical
spelling, or	locations, imaging	locations, imaging	locations, imaging	locations, imaging	describing	locations, imaging
grammar;	results, medication	results, medication	results, medication	results, medication	husbandry,	results, medication
and/or	etc. Poor attention	etc. Inadequate	etc. Adequate	etc. Good	clinical	etc. Excellent
failing to	to detail in spelling	attention to detail	attention to detail	attention to detail	findings,	attention
address the	and grammar. Poor	in spelling and	in spelling and	in spelling and	anatomical	to detail in spelling
specific	reference	grammar.	grammar.	grammar. Good	locations,	and grammar.
requirements	formatting, not	Inadequate	Adequate	reference	imaging	Excellent reference
of the	using the Harvard	reference	reference	formatting using	results,	formatting using
assignment.	Style.	formatting	formatting using	the Harvard Style.	medication	the Harvard Style.
		using the Harvard	the Harvard Style.		etc. Very good	
		Style.	narvaru Style.		attention to	

					detail in spelling and grammar. Very good reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	
Concise writing	style and adherence to	expected word count				
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Expected word count is markedly exceeded (e.g. 20% or more). With or without distinct lack of concise writing and / or repetition or redundant material.	Word count is moderately exceeded (e.g. by about 10-20%). There is marked lack of concise writing, with repetition or redundant phrases.	Word count is moderately exceeded (e.g. by about 10-20%). Writing is less concise, containing moderate repetition or redundant phrases.	Word count stays within about 10% of expected. Writing is less concise, and candidate less able to discriminate between relevant and extraneous information.	Word count stays within about 10% of expected. Good concise writing, discriminating between relevant and extraneous information.	Very good concise 'to-the- point' writing and discrimination between relevant and extraneous information. Possibly slightly exceeding expected word count (by no more than about 10%).	Excellent ability to write concisely and discriminate between relevant and extraneous information, and very closely adhering to expected word count.