**Case Report Marking Criteria**

Please also refer to University guidelines on written material.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** |  **Case Report A and B** |
| Distinction70-100% | Work of exceptional standard reflecting outstanding competence/knowledge of material and critical ability above and beyond those required for a pass mark. |
| Merit60-69% | Work with a well-defined focus, reflecting a good working competence/knowledge of material and a good level of competence in its critical assessments and beyond those required for a pass mark. |
| Pass50-59% | Work demonstrating adequate competence/working knowledge of material and evidence of some analysis. Work adheres to the relevant NICE or clinical guideline.A piece of work in this category should include the following (unless a clear rationale for exceptions is given):Reason for selecting this case, the presenting problems should be clearly identified and described with goals for therapy included. Where available an appropriate model should be used. The assessment should include factors relevant to the development and maintenance of the difficulties. Where appropriate the relevant disorder specific assessment and outcome tools should be used as well as IAPT required measures. A formulation should be present in diagrammatic **and** written form. This formulation should flow logically from assessment and include precipitating and maintaining factors and where appropriate predisposing/developmental factors. The intervention plan should be clearly described and flow logically from formulation. The interventions should be clearly described, have clear rationale and flow logically from formulation. Outcome of the intervention should be described and evaluated.There should be some critical analysis and reflection on the work and the therapeutic alliance. Throughout the report, a professional and ethical stance should be demonstrated. References and awareness of relevant literature generally accurate but limited. Adheres to word count. |
| CondonableFail 40-49% | Limited competence/knowledge of core material and limited critical ability. Poorly written and presented/structured piece of work. Rationale and arguments are absent or problematic. Inappropriate application of theory to practice. References may not have conformed to University guidelines. |
| Fail0-39 | Lacking in basic competence/knowledge of core material and absence or major flaws in critical analysis. Unethical practice, breaches in confidentiality. |