|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NGR rubric** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** |  |  |  |  | **Points** |
| Case Study Analysis and Presentation, Pertinent Complication Addressed | **5 pts****Excellent (5)**Thoroughly analyzes and presents all aspects of the case study with exceptional depth and clarity. Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the patient's medical history, diagnosis, complication, treatment plan, and patient education. Additionally, it addresses a pertinent complication, showcasing an insightful integration of relevant information. Role-based input is well-integrated and demonstrates critical thinking. | **4 pts****Good**Analyzes and presents most aspects of the case study with good depth and clarity. Demonstrates a solid understanding of the patient's medical history, diagnosis, complication, treatment plan, and education. Effectively addresses a pertinent complication, though with slightly less depth compared to an Excellent rating. Role-based input is adequately integrated and shows effective critical thinking. | **3 pts****Fair**Analyzes and presents some aspects of the case study with satisfactory depth and clarity. Demonstrates a basic understanding of the patient's medical history, diagnosis, complication, treatment plan, and education. Adequately addresses a pertinent complication, but with limited depth. Role-based input is somewhat integrated and shows limited critical thinking | **2 pts****Needs Improvement**Analyzes and presents a few aspects of the case study with limited depth and clarity. Demonstrates a partial understanding of the patient's medical history, diagnosis, complication, treatment plan, and patient education. Addresses a pertinent complication, but with minimal depth. Role-based input lacks integration and critical thinking | **0 pts****Poor**Fails to adequately analyze and present the case study. Demonstrates poor understanding of the patient's medical history, diagnosis, complication, treatment plan, and patient education. Role-based input is absent or inappropriate. | 5 pts |
| Team Collaboration and Roles | **5 pts****Excellent (5)**Demonstrates excellent collaboration within the group. Roles are well-defined, and each student takes responsibility for their assigned role. All team members contributed effectively to the simulation presentation. Roles align with the assigned peer evaluations. | **4 pts****Good**Demonstrates good collaboration within the group. Roles are defined, and most students take responsibility for their assigned roles. Most team members contributed effectively to the simulation presentation. Roles mostly align with the assigned peer evaluations. | **3 pts****Fair**Demonstrates satisfactory collaboration within the group. Roles are somewhat defined, and some students take responsibility for their assigned roles. Some team members contributed to the simulation presentation. Roles partially align with the assigned peer evaluations. | **2 pts****Needs Improvement**Collaboration within the group is limited. Roles are unclear, and only a few students take responsibility for their assigned roles. Few team members contributed to the simulation presentation. Roles minimally align with the assigned peer evaluations. | **0 pts****Poor**Collaboration within the group needs to be improved. Roles are undefined, and students are not responsible for their assigned roles—no effective contribution to the simulation presentation. Assigned peer evaluations significantly misalign with observed teamwork. | 5 pts |
| Presentation Skills |

|  |
| --- |
| **5 pts****Excellent (5)**Demonstrates exceptional presentation skills, maintaining clear articulation, appropriate pace, and engaging body language throughout the presentation. |

 | **4 pts****Good**Demonstrates good presentation skills, maintaining mostly clear articulation, appropriate pace, and engaged body language during the presentation | **3 pts****Fair**Demonstrates satisfactory presentation skills, with occasional clarity issues, uneven pace, or body language distractions. | **2 pts****Needs Improvement**Presentation skills are limited, with consistent clarity issues, uneven pace, or distracting body language. | **0 pts****Poor**Presentation skills are poor, with unclear articulation, inappropriate pace, and disengaged body language. | 5 pts |
| Patient Education and Peer-Reviewed Journal | **5 pts****Excellent (5)**Provides exceptional patient education using a relevant peer-reviewed journal. Education is well-structured, evidence-based, and tailored to the patient's needs. The chosen journal is recent, relevant, and adds significant value to patient education. | **4 pts****Good**Provides good patient education using a relevant peer-reviewed journal. Education is clear, evidence-based, and relevant to the patient's needs. The chosen journal is recent and contributes to patient education. | **3 pts****Fair**Provides satisfactory patient education using a peer-reviewed journal. Education is basic and somewhat tailored to the patient's needs. The chosen journal is less recent or slightly less relevant to patient education. | **2 pts****Needs Improvement**Provides limited patient education with minimal use of a peer-reviewed journal. Education lacks structure and relevance to the patient's needs. The chosen journal is not recent or not entirely relevant. | **0 pts****Poor**Fails to provide patient education or uses an inappropriate or outdated source. Education is absent or misleading—no use of a peer-reviewed journal. | 5 pts |
| Peer Evaluation | **5 pts****Full Marks**Provides insightful and fair peer evaluations, highlighting individual contributions, teamwork, and communication. Assessments are constructive, specific, and support the given scores |  |  |  | **0 pts****No Marks**Provides inadequate or biased peer evaluations, failing to recognize individual contributions, teamwork, and communication. Assessments lack constructive feedback and do not explain the given scores. | 5 pts |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Points: 25 |