|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Patient-Centered Case Study Presentation Rubric** | | |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | **Pts** |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Case Study Questions | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks-Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  Responses to ALL questions are clearly and accurately answered as it pertains to information provided within case study. Responses are individualized to the patient within the case study, tailored to meet the needs of the patient. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  At least 7 questions contain responses that are clearly and accurately answered as it pertains to case study. Some responses are individualized to the patient within the case study, tailored to meet the needs of the patient | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  At least 5 questions contain responses that are clearly and accurately answered as it pertains to case study. Responses are broad, are not patient centered, and/or not tailored to meet the needs of the patient. | **0 pts**  **No Marks-Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  Responses to questions lack clarity, accuracy, and/or appropriateness for case study. Responses are confusing, broad, are not patient-centered, and/or not tailored to meet the needs of the patient. | | 4 pts |
| Information presented is accurate, stimulated learning by engaging the audience. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  Information was accurate, stimulated learning, and elicited audience participation. All questions from the case study were accurately discussed/ presented. Team kept audience updated/ informed on changes in patient status and transitions during case study. Minimum of 3 activities were provided for the audience to solicit a response. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  Information was accurate and stimulated learning, elicited much audience participation. Minimum of 2 questions/ activities were asked to the audience to solicit a response. | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  Information was accurate but basic, minimal interaction with the audience. Minimum of 1 questions/activities were asked to the audience to solicit a response. | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  Information was not accurate and/or was superficial, no audience interaction. No questions were asked to the audience to solicit a response. | | 4 pts |
| Analysis of the case stud had good correlation of the accompanying questions and able to see the relationship between multiple concepts. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  All questions were threaded through the presentation and answered with critical thinking, clinical judgment, and decision making to bring all the components together. Able to discuss interrelated concepts within the presentation seeing the relationship between concepts. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  Most of the presentation consisted of a high level of correlation, understanding, and analysis of case study and questions. Identified some interrelated concepts and their relationship between one another. | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  Basic correlation, understanding, and analysis of the case study. Did not identify interrelated concepts and relationship. | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  Little to no analysis, understanding, or correlation of the case or questions. Did not identify interrelated concepts and relationship. | | 4 pts |
| Presentation was professional, all members presented some part of the case study. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  All members of the team participated with high degree of professionalism, including introductions. Presentation clearly demonstrates collaboration due to smooth transition between slides. Presentation was clear to understand. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  All team members presented some part of the case study. Some of the slides show cohesiveness demonstrating collaboration to creating presentation. Presentation was clear to understand. | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  Most Team members presented parts of the case study. Presentation did not show cohesiveness and collaboration among team member. Presentation was not clear to understand. | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  Not all team members participated. Presentation was not clear to understand. | | 4 pts |
| Organization and Appearance of Slides. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  Content is presented in a logical order (sequence noted within the case study). Font is large enough to be viewed at a distance (not overly wordy). Design and layout make the text easy to read and are visually pleasing (Images help audience understand and pull info together). The presentation was within the 15-minute time frame | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  Content is generally presented in a logical order (sequence noted within the case study). Font on most slides is large enough to view at a distance (not overly wordy). Design makes text easy to read and layout uses most space appropriately (includes a few images throughout the presentation). The presentation was within 3 minutes of the 15-minute time frame | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  Content is not in logical order (sequence noted within case study). Font is too small and/or design makes content somewhat difficult to follow. Does not include any images or images do not add value to the presentation. The presentation was within 5 minutes of the 15-minute time frame | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations**- 0 points  Sequencing of content is confusing. Font is too small and/or design makes content difficult to read. Layout is cluttered or inconsistent. The presentation was over 5 minutes above the 15-minute time frame | | 4 pts |
| Audio and Video | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  Animations, sounds, and/or video assist in presenting an overall theme that appeals to the audience and enhances concepts with a high impact message. All multimedia elements work well together and demonstrate excellent synthesis. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  Animations, sounds, and/or video assist the audience in understanding the flow of information or content. Multimedia elements are appropriate and enhance the presentation. | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  Animations, sounds and/or video seem unrelated to the topic/theme and do not enhance concepts Multimedia elements support the presentation occasionally. | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  None Audio and Video. If animations, sounds and/or video are used, they are unrelated to the content or are distracting. Audio is cutoff and inconsistent. Difficulty in communicating the main ideas | | 4 pts |
| References | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4 pts**  **Full Marks--Exceeds Expectations-4 points**  A complete and accurate bibliography that is useful in directing the audience to cited sources. | **3 pts**  **Meets Expectations-3 points**  A well-developed bibliography that contains little to no errors but successfully cites all sources. | **2 pts**  **Partially Meets Expectations-2 points**  An attempt at a bibliography that may contain errors in formatting. | **0 pts**  **No Marks--Does Not Meet Expectations- 0 points**  None | | 4 pts |
| Total Points: 28 | | |