

<b>Document Title</b>	<b>Marking Rubric Case Studies</b>
<b>Document Code</b>	071_FORM
<b>Version number</b>	1.0
<b>Author</b>	Chris Jacobs
<b>Approved by</b>	Deputy Chair
<b>Date approved</b>	16/11/24

## Case Study Descriptions

Submit three case studies. Each case study is marked out of 20. The total combined score for the case studies comprises 60% of the total mark.

**Case study 1** should focus on a counselling issue. Demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a counselling theory, identify and justify the selected counselling theory and discuss how this was applied in practice. Reflect on what you have learned from the case and how this learning will inform your future practice to achieve better outcomes for your patients.

**Case study 2** should focus on an ethical issue which should be clearly identified, e.g. confidentiality, autonomy etc. Demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the ethical issues surrounding genetic counselling. Discuss the application of bioethical principles to the case, presenting a clear and logical argument. Reflect on what you have learned from the case and how this learning will inform your future practice to achieve better outcomes for your patients.

**Case study 3** should focus on a scientific issue. Demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the scientific principles that inform clinical practice relevant to the case study. Explain how this scientific knowledge was used to help the patient move forward with the problem that brought them to the genetics clinic. Reflect on what you have learned from the case and how this learning will inform your future practice to achieve better outcomes for your patients.

## Guidance

Please note: The terms highlighted in blue are explained in the Helpful Resources section below.

**Structure and content:** The case studies should be set out using the headings below:

- Title: Specific topic being addressed: i.e. ethics, counselling, scientific.
- Diagrams: The use of diagrams is permitted and will not be included in the word count. However, the explanation in the text must also demonstrate understanding.
- Context: Briefly set out the context of your contact with the patient/family. Identify the specific issues raised. Pedigrees may be used if relevant and will not be included in the word count.
- Background: Present a [synthesis](#) and [critical appraisal](#) of the relevant [theories/principles](#) and the subject literature.
- Discussion: Discuss the selected theories/principles and the application to practice.
- Outcome and critical reflection: Critically discuss and reflect on the outcome and impact on your future practice.
- References: Use [APA7 referencing style](#). (N.B. In text references are included in the word count but not the reference list.)
- Use an [academic writing](#) style i.e. Write in proper sentences without jargon or colloquialisms (see 033 DOC General tips for Academic Writing).
- Any reference to individual patients must be anonymised and this should be clear in the case study.

**Assessment:** The case studies will be assessed at master's level (academic level 7). Please read the instructions carefully and familiarise yourself with the rubric before writing the case study. You will be assessed on the extent to which your case study meets the following criteria:

- Clearly identify the case study in the title, i.e. counselling, ethical or scientific, and briefly describe the selected case to provide context and identify the specific issues raised by the case. (N.B. This section should make up 10% or less of the total word count.)
- Synthesise and critically appraise the theories/principles and subject literature relevant to the case study, demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding and identifying limits in the knowledge base.
- Critically discuss the relevance of the selected theories/principles to the case, the rationale for selection and application to the case.
- Demonstrate professional competence, maintaining professional boundaries, and applying personal, social and ethical principles, including cultural safety and respect. Critically reflect on own counselling practice, act on feedback and discuss the implications for own future practice.
- Demonstrate clear, succinct and logical writing and presentation skills, following task instructions and academic conventions regarding writing style, referencing (APA7), spelling, grammar and punctuation.



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 2 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24

## Case Study Rubric

Criteria	Ratings				Total possible points
<p><b>Context</b></p> <p>Clearly identify the case study in the title and briefly describe the selected case to provide context and identify the specific issues raised by the case. (10% or less of the word count)</p>	<p><b>0.5 pt</b></p> <p>Meets the task instructions</p>		<p><b>0 pt</b></p> <p>Does not meet the task instructions.</p>		<p><b>0.5</b></p>
<p><b>Knowledge, understanding, synthesis and critical appraisal</b></p> <p>Synthesise and critically appraise the theories/principles and subject literature relevant to the case study, demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding and</p>	<p><b>&gt;4.0 to 5.5 pts Excellent</b></p> <p>Excellent synthesis and critical appraisal of theories/principles and subject literature from a range of sources, demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding</p>	<p><b>&gt;2.5 to 4.0 pts Good</b></p> <p>Good synthesis and/or critical appraisal of theories/principles and subject literature from three or more sources, demonstrating a good level of knowledge and</p>	<p><b>&gt;1.0 to 2.5 pts Fair</b></p> <p>Description of theories/principles and subject literature from at least two sources with some/limited critical appraisal, demonstrating adequate knowledge and understanding</p>	<p><b>0 to 1.0 pts Poor</b></p> <p>Description of theories/principles and/or subject literature from limited sources or with no/ limited critical appraisal, demonstrating poor knowledge and understanding with</p>	<p><b>5.5</b></p>



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 3 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24

identifying limits in the knowledge base.	and awareness of limitations in the knowledge base.	understanding with some awareness of limitations in the knowledge base.	with some awareness of limits in the knowledge base.	little/no awareness of limits in the knowledge base.	
<p><b>Relevance, rationale for selection and application of theories/principles</b></p> <p>Critically discuss the relevance of the selected theories/principles to the case, the rationale for selection and application to the case.</p>	<p><b>&gt;4.0 to 5.5 pts Excellent</b></p> <p>In-depth, clear, and critical discussion of the relevance of the theories/principles, rationale for selection and application to the case.</p>	<p><b>&gt;2.5 to 4.0 pts Good</b></p> <p>Good discussion, with some critical appraisal, of the relevance of the theories/principles, rationale for selection and application to the case.</p>	<p><b>&gt;1.0 to 2.5 pts Fair</b></p> <p>Fair description of the relevance of the theories/principles, rationale for selection and application to the case. Some evidence of critical appraisal.</p>	<p><b>0 to 1.0 pts Poor</b></p> <p>Limited/no explanation of the relevance of the theories/principles, rationale for selection or application to the case. No/limited critical appraisal.</p>	<b>5.5</b>
<p><b>Professional values and behaviours, ethical and social responsibilities and cultural safety</b></p> <p>Demonstrate professional competence, maintaining professional boundaries, and applying personal, social and ethical principles, including cultural safety and</p>	<p><b>&gt;4.0 to 5.5 pts Excellent</b></p> <p>Demonstrates professional competence and awareness of professional boundaries. Applies personal, social and ethical principles,</p>	<p><b>&gt;2.5 to 4.0 pts Good</b></p> <p>Demonstrates professional competence and awareness of professional boundaries. Applies at least two out of personal, social or</p>	<p><b>&gt;1.0 to 2.5 pts Fair</b></p> <p>Professionally safe, although limited evidence of working within professional boundaries. Applies either personal or social or ethical principles, demonstrating limited</p>	<p><b>0 to 1.0 pts Poor</b></p> <p>Professionally unsafe with limited/no evidence of working within professional boundaries OR limited/ no application of personal, social or</p>	<b>5.5</b>



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 4 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24

respect. Critically reflect on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	demonstrating cultural safety and respect. Critically reflects on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	ethical principles, demonstrating some awareness of cultural safety and respect. Some evidence of critical reflection on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	awareness of cultural safety and respect. Limited evidence of critical reflection on own counselling practice or acting on feedback or discussing implications for own future practice.	ethical principles demonstrating limited awareness of cultural safety and respect. No evidence of critical reflection on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	
<b>Academic writing and presentation skills</b>	<b>&gt;2.5 to 3.0 pts Excellent</b>	<b>&gt;1.5 to 2.5 pts Good</b>	<b>&gt;0.5 to 1.5 pts Fair</b>	<b>0 to 0.5 pts Poor</b>	<b>3</b>
Demonstrate clear, succinct and logical writing and presentation skills following the task instructions and academic conventions regarding referencing, spelling, grammar and punctuation.	Writing is clear and succinct with logical arguments and conclusions. The report is well structured with clear transitions between sections. No (or only minor) spelling and grammatical errors, keeping within the required word count	Writing is mostly clear and succinct. Arguments and conclusions are mostly clear and logical. The report is well structured with some use of headings. No (or only minor) spelling and grammatical errors.	Writing is mostly unclear or wordy. Arguments and conclusions could be clearer/more logical. Limited structure and a few headings. Multiple spelling/grammatical errors. Over/under the word limit (10-20% over/under). Some	Disorganised and poorly written. Arguments and conclusions are missing, unclear or not logical. Significant spelling and grammatical errors. Significantly over/under the word limit (more than 20% over/under).	



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 5 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24

	and academic conventions regarding referencing, spelling, grammar and punctuation. Keeps to the word limit (+/- 10%). Uses APA7 referencing correctly.	Keeps to the word limit (+/- 10%) Uses/ mostly uses APA7 referencing correctly.	errors in referencing/ does not use APA7 referencing.	Multiple errors in referencing.	
<b>Total</b>					<b>20</b>



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 6 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24

## Helpful Resources

- Synthesis: <https://www.anu.edu.au/students/academic-skills/academic-integrity/using-sources/synthesising>
- Critical appraisal: <https://www.uts.edu.au/current-students/support/helps/self-help-resources/academic-skills/how-write-critically>  
<https://libguides.bham.ac.uk/c.php?g=654983&p=4603309>
- Theory: <https://dictionary.apa.org/theory>
- Principle: <https://dictionary.apa.org/principle>
- Academic writing: <https://subjectguides.york.ac.uk/academic-writing>
- APA 7 referencing style: <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples>
- Essay writing: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/mar/07/how-to-write-an-essay>
- The way the trustworthiness of a study is assessed depends on the type of study:
  - Quantitative studies – validity, reliability and reproducibility: [Heale, R., & Twycross, A. \(2015\). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. \*Evidence-based nursing\*, 18\(3\), 66–67. https://doi-org.surrey.idm.oclc.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129](https://doi-org.surrey.idm.oclc.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129)
  - Qualitative studies – eg rigour, transparency, coherence: [Noble H, Smith J. \(2015\) Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. \*Evidence-Based Nursing\*; 18:34-35.](https://doi-org.surrey.idm.oclc.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129)
- Systematic reviews: [Page M J, McKenzie J E, Bossuyt P M, Boutron I, Hoffmann T C, Mulrow C D et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews \*BMJ\* 2021; 372 :n71 doi:10.1136/bmj.n71](https://doi-org.surrey.idm.oclc.org/10.1136/bmj.n71)

See also General tips for Academic Writing (033\_DOC).



The GCRAB is a not for profit Company Limited by Guarantee: 06963771

<b>Document Code: 071_FORM</b>	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Georgie Hall
<b>Version: 1.0</b>	Page 7 of 7	Issue date: 29/11/24