

Document Title	Marking Rubric Case Studies
Document Code	071_FORM
Version number	V2.0
Author	Chris Jacobs
Approved by	Chair
Date approved	17/12/25

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.

Format: To aid marking, each case study **must** be formatted as follows:

- Double spaced type in Arial 12pt font with standard size margins (i.e. 2.54 cm).
- The word limit is 2000. The word count must be clearly documented. Case studies that are 10% under or over this limit are acceptable. Case studies that are 10-20% over/under the word limit **may be sent for moderation**. Case studies that are more than 20% under or over the word limit will **automatically be sent for Moderation**. N.B. Case studies sent for moderation may be deferred.
- Figures (including pedigrees) and tables should be referred to in the text and placed in Appendix 1 with clear and accurate legends. N.B. Figures and tables that appear in the main body of the work WILL be included in the word count.
- Appendices will NOT be included in the word count. Appendices other than Appendix 1 will not necessarily be marked.
- Headings should be used to help the reader to navigate the case study.
- **Structure and content:** The case studies should be set out using the headings below:
 - Title: Specific topic being addressed: i.e. ethics, counselling, scientific.
 - 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 take 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.



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

Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 2 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

- 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.

Case Study Rubric

Criteria	Ratings				Total possible points
Context 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.	0.5 pt Meets the task instructions	0 pt Does not meet the task instructions.			0.5
Knowledge, understanding, synthesis and critical appraisal Synthesise and critically appraise the theories/principles and subject literature relevant to the case study, demonstrating sound	>4.0 to 5.5 pts Excellent Excellent synthesis and critical appraisal of theories/principles and subject literature from a range of sources,	>2.5 to 4.0 pts Good Good synthesis and/or critical appraisal of theories/principles and subject literature from three or more sources,	>1.0 to 2.5 pts Fair Description of theories/principles and subject literature from at least two sources with some/limited critical appraisal,	0 to 1.0 pts Poor Description of theories/principles and/or subject literature from limited sources or with no/ limited critical appraisal,	5.5



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

Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 3 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

Ensuring expertise to serve families with genetic conditions

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

Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 4 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

and applying personal, social and ethical principles, including cultural safety and respect. Critically reflect on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	boundaries. Applies personal, social and ethical principles, demonstrating cultural safety and respect. Critically reflects on own counselling practice, acting on feedback and discussing implications for own future practice.	boundaries. Applies at least two out of personal, social or 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.	either personal or social or ethical principles, demonstrating limited 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.	limited/ no application of personal, social or 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.	
Academic writing and presentation skills	>2.5 to 3.0 pts Excellent	>1.5 to 2.5 pts Good	>0.5 to 1.5 pts Fair	0 to 0.5 pts Poor	3
Demonstrate clear, succinct and logical writing and presentation skills. Keeps to the required format and word limit. Follows 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	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	Writing is mostly unclear or wordy. Arguments and conclusions could be clearer/more logical. Limited structure and a few headings. Multiple spelling/grammatical	Disorganised and poorly written. Arguments and conclusions are missing, unclear or not logical. Significant spelling and grammatical errors.	

Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 5 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

	grammatical errors, keeping within the word limit (+/- 10%) and academic conventions regarding referencing, spelling, grammar and punctuation. Formatted correctly. Uses APA7 referencing correctly.	and grammatical errors. Keeps to the word limit (+/- 10%). Formatted correctly. Uses/ mostly uses APA7 referencing correctly.	errors. 10-20% over/under the word limit (N.B. Case studies meeting this criterion may be sent for moderation.) Mostly formatted correctly. Some errors in referencing/ does not use APA7 referencing.	Multiple errors in referencing. Not formatted correctly. Over/under the word limit by more than 20% (N.B. Case studies meeting this criterion will automatically be sent for moderation).	
Total					20

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)

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



Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 6 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

- Qualitative studies – e.g. rigour, transparency, coherence: [Noble H, Smith J. \(2015\) Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-Based Nursing*; 18:34-35.](#)
- 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](#)

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



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

Document Code: 071_FORM	Author: Chris Jacobs	Approver: Chair
Version: 2.0	Page 7 of 7	Issue date: 17/12/25

Ensuring expertise to serve families with genetic conditions