

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 attention to communication of the pertinent aspects of the case.	Not clearly or logically presented; and/or details of the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management omitted/disordered/ illogical.	Inadequate communication of the main facts of the case. Some details of the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management omitted or not well ordered/illogical.	Adequate communication of the main facts of the case including the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management. Information presented less logically.	Good communication of the main facts of the case including the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management. Good ability to present	Very good communication of the main facts of the case including the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management. Very good ability	Excellent communication of the main facts of the case including the population group(s), approach to evaluation of ration and feed & water delivery, and relevant factors in herd/flock management. Excellent ability to present information

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

		observation into appraisal and conclusion.			observation into appraisal and conclusion.	
Demonstration of critical reflection centred on evidence-based medicine (EBVM)						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
No attempt to include critical reflection or use evidence-based medicine in discussion of the case.	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 literature and/or use the clinical and/or literature evidence to reflect on the case.	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 to review the relevant literature and/or use the clinical and/or literature evidence to reflect on the case.	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 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 management.	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 justify statements and critical review of the flock/herd management.	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 available clinical and/or literature evidence to justify statements and 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 technique and construction						
Very Poor (0%)	Poor (20%)	Inadequate (40%)	Adequate (50%)	Good (65%)	Very Good (80%)	Excellent (100%)
Very little overall attention to detail and construction, e.g. very poor attention to detail in terminology, language, spelling, or grammar; and/or failing to address the specific requirements of the assignment.	Poor overall attention to detail and construction, e.g. poor use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Poor attention to detail in spelling and grammar. Poor reference formatting, not using the Harvard Style.	Inadequate overall attention to detail and construction, e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Inadequate attention to detail in spelling and grammar. Inadequate reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Adequate overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Adequate attention to detail in spelling and grammar. Adequate reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Good overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Good attention to detail in spelling and grammar. Good reference formatting using the Harvard Style.	Very good overall attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Very good attention to	Excellent over attention to detail and construction e.g. in use of correct and precise terminology when describing husbandry, clinical findings, anatomical locations, imaging results, medication etc. Excellent attention to detail in spelling and grammar. Excellent reference formatting using the Harvard Style.

					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.