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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Introduction**  **Conclusion** | Highly relevant comprehensive introduction  Defines topic and includes a comprehensive introduction to the essay  Excellent synthesis of information from assignment that clearly ties highly relevant main points together.  Well-structured, concise reflection on importance of findings. | Well-developed introduction  Defines the topic and includes an introduction to the essay  Quality synthesis of information from assignment that clearly ties relevant main points together.  Well-structured, concise reflection on importance of findings. | Effective attempt of writing introduction that outlines essay  Above average synthesis of information from assignment clearly ties main points together.  Concise reflection demonstrates importance of findings. | An attempt made to provide an introduction, however appeared unclear.  The topic is simply defined.  Demonstration of synthesis from assignment evident with some points from assignment discussed.  Importance of findings indicated. | Inadequate and/or poor introduction.  Minimal/no evidence of an overview of the essay.    Inappropriate or absent conclusion.  Conclusion includes new material.  Referenced material in conclusion. |
| **MARKS (15)** | **4.25-5** | **3-4** | **2.5** | **2** | **0-1** |
| **Critical Skills: Prioritising of major concepts of care** | Excellent reasoning in prioritising of concepts arising from the case study  Prioritised plan of care is highly synthesised and well-structured, with a very clear and coherent synthesis of the clinical data and supported with multiple literature sources  Excellently justifies judgments and reasons for decisions / courses of action (e.g. related to pt. cues, goals / expected outcomes / evidence)  Very logical / clear / succinct progression of concepts / ideas demonstrated / presents as a unified whole  Excellent analysis, well prioritised care detailed and succinctly communicated | Good reasoning in prioritising concepts arising from the case study with one omission  Prioritised plan of care is well synthesised and structured, with a clear and coherent synthesis of the clinical data and supported with multiple literature sources  Clearly justifies judgments and reasons for decisions / courses of action (e.g. related to pt. cues, goals / expected outcomes / evidence)  Good logical / clear / succinct progression of concepts / ideas demonstrated / presents as a unified whole  Good analysis, well prioritised care detailed and succinctly communicated | Reasoning in prioritising concepts arising from the case study has been partially addressed with some major omissions  Prioritised plan of care is synthesised and structured, with some demonstration of synthesis of the clinical data and supported with some literature sources  Justifies judgments and reasons for decisions / courses of action (e.g. related to pt. cues, goals / expected outcomes / evidence) satisfactorily  Some logical progression of concepts / ideas however further development / clarity needed.  Analysis of the case evident with some prioritised care demonstrated and at times well communicated | Reasoning in prioritising concepts arising from the case study has been attempted, but has omitted more relevant priorities  Prioritised plan of care is provided but with minimal synthesis of the clinical data and an unclear structure with minimal reference to literature sources  Judgments and reasons for decisions / courses of action (e.g. related to pt. cues, goals / expected outcomes / evidence) are inadequately justified  Limited logical progression of concepts / ideas however further development / clarity needed.  Minimal analysis of the case evident. Care is not well prioritised, or clearly communicated | Clinical reasoning and synthesis of concepts arising from the case study is minimal or absent  Prioritised plan of care is not synthesised or structured coherently. There is limited or no reference to literature sources  No judgment and reasons for decisions / courses of action (e.g. related to pt. cues, goals / expected outcomes / evidence) demonstrated  No / lack of logical progression of concepts underpinning case study.  No analysis evident e.g. lack of priority development in actions/ interventions / approach to dealing with deterioration |
| **MARKS (15)** | **13.25-15** | **10.5-13** | **7.5-10** | **4-7** | **0-3.5** |
| **Content analysis:**  **Knowledge and understanding, nursing interventions /rationales** | Evaluation of the case demonstrates depth of understanding of pathophysiology and prioritisation of nursing interventions that could be actioned in practice  Excellent breadth and depth of actions / clear / succinct in approach, priorities well define  Highly articulate rationales succinctly related to the nursing interventions and nursing actions very well detailed  The relationship between comorbidities and recovery from a GA/ surgical procedure are critically discussed demonstrating excellent understanding with rationales fully explained.  Excellent sources used to support actions / interventions quality (evidenced based) & demonstrate depth and breadth of reading. Quality research sources – contextual to the case study  Discharge planning very clear / succinct, detailed | Evaluation of the case demonstrates understanding of the pathophysiology and some prioritisation of nursing interventions that could be actioned in practice  Good breadth of nursing actions: including assessment / monitoring / interventions included, evidence of prioritisation of actions appropriate to the case study  Good rationale included / relates to the intervention / action chosen and well detailed  The relationship between comorbidities and recovery from a GA / surgical procedure are well explored and logically presented with rationales that are satisfactorily explained.  Very good sources used to demonstrate depth of understanding e.g. some use of evidenced based papers mostly contextual to the case scenario  Discharge planning clear and succinct | Evaluation of the case is sometimes clear and there is some understanding of pathophysiology with some interventions that could be actioned in practice  Clear nursing actions: including assessment / monitoring / interventions included some prioritisation of actions mostly appropriate to the case study  Rationales for the nursing interventions and the implications for practice are outlined however further rationales could be provided  The relationship between comorbidities and recovery from a GA/surgical procedure are explored with some depth and sometimes well explained  Fair breadth of sources used demonstrate understanding e.g. some use of evidenced based research with some contextual to the case scenario  Discharge planning included however broad and requires more detail | Evaluation provides a narrative to the reader outlining minimal understanding of pathophysiology and or formulation of relevant nursing interventions that could be actioned in practice.  Some nursing actions including: assessment / ongoing monitoring / interventions included however priorities are not well defined  Rationales included however explanation not clear or not focused / specific enough to the action/ intervention  The relationship between comorbidities and recovery from a GA/surgical procedure are minimally explored and some confusion evident.  Minimal breadth of sources utilised / lacks depth e.g. mainly text / with minimal use of evidenced based journal articles  Satisfactory discharge planning, could be more specific at times | Evaluation of the case is not clear and concise to the reader with no or limited suggested nursing interventions that could be actioned in practice  Nursing actions including: assessment /monitoring / interventions minimal / not evident / inadequately prioritised  Rationales are limited, vague or absent  The relationship between comorbidities and recovery from a GA / surgical procedure is not dealt with and / or are confused and not clear.  No / inadequate / limited literature sources used to support work presented e.g. over 7 years old and lack of evidenced based research e.g. uses mainly texts  No / minimal discharge planning included, vague / too broad |
| **MARKS (5)** | **13.25-15** | **10.5-13** | **7.5-10** | **4-7** | **0-3.5** |
| **Academic Writing: structure, APA referencing expression /grammar** | **Word limit**: Adhered to word limit  **Expression**  High standard of academic presentation. Expressed ideas clearly, concisely & fluently  Very few/no spelling or grammatical errors  **Structure**  Well-constructed paragraphs  Main points linked to the question  Presentation is extremely appealing and engaging  **Referencing**  Correctly cited sources both within text & reference list. No/limited mistakes in referencing format | **Word limit:** Adhered to word limit +/- 10% **Expression**  Sound academic structure and presentation  Expressed ideas clearly and concisely, thoughts expressed clearly  Very few spelling or grammatical errors  **Structure**  Well-constructed paragraphs, clearly expressed & linked main points  Presentation is appealing and engaging  **Referencing**  References to literature are good | **Word limit:** Adhered to word limit +/- 10% **Expression**  Expressed ideas clearly, however not concisely & fluently, thoughts not clearly articulated  Some spelling and grammatical errors  **Structure**  Provided paragraphs with main points however not clearly expressed  Presentation is pleasing and mostly engaging  **Referencing**  References to literature are satisfactory | **Word limit:** Adhered to word limit (+/-10%  **Expression**  Limited clarity of expression, vague or narrative only  Errors in spelling & grammar  **Structure**  Provided paragraphs but either main points were inappropriate or they were not linked key content areas.  Presentation is somewhat pleasing and engaging  **Referencing**  Reference to literature is present but not strong | **Word limit:** Not adhered to  **Expression**  Used incorrect terminology  Numerous mistakes in spelling and/or grammar  **Structure**  No or limited structure  Presentation does not answer the question and is not engaging  **Referencing**  Literature not appropriate or insufficient  Incorrect referencing |
|  | **4.25-5** | 3-4 | **2.5** | **2** | **0-1** |
|  | | | | | |
| Marker Comments:  FINAL MARK:  /40 | | | | | |