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|  | **Meets or Exceeds Expectations** | **Approaches Expectations** | **Below Expectations** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | Points Range:4.3 (4.3%) - 5 (5%)Introduction summarizes the case comprehensively and prepares the reader for the remainder of the paper. | Points Range:3.65 (3.65%) - 4.25 (4.25%)Introduction summarizes the case and somewhat prepares the reader for the remainder of the paper. | Points Range:3 (3%) - 3.6 (3.6%)Introduction lacks detail to prepare the reader for the case. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 2.95 (2.95%)Introduction is not present or is grossly erroneous. |
| **Heart failure and pathogenisis** | Points Range:11.18 (11.18%) - 13 (13%)Identifies and thoroughly explains type of heart failure and the pathogenesis. Information is scientifically sound, thorough, supported and sufficient. | Points Range:9.49 (9.49%) - 11.05 (11.05%)Mostly Identifies and thoroughly explains type of heart failure and the pathogenesis. Information is scientifically sound, thorough, necessary and sufficient. | Points Range:7.8 (7.8%) - 9.36 (9.36%)Provides insufficient explanations Information is not entirely scientifically sound, necessary or supported with evidence and a sound rationale. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.67 (7.67%)Does not or incorrect answers with insufficient explanations. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient |
| **Bronchitis** | Points Range:11.18 (11.18%) - 13 (13%)Provides clinical findings, treatment, and recommendations of chronic bronchitis. Information is scientifically sound, thorough, supported and sufficient | Points Range:9.49 (9.49%) - 11.05 (11.05%)Provides most clinical findings, treatment, and recommendations of chronic bronchitis but may be limited. Information is mostly scientifically sound, thorough, necessary and sufficient | Points Range:7.8 (7.8%) - 9.36 (9.36%)Provides insufficient explanations of rationale. Information is not entirely scientifically sound, necessary and sufficient. Does not address the context sufficiently or with sound rationale. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.67 (7.67%)Does not or incorrect answers with insufficient explanations. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient |
| **Hypertension** | Points Range:11.18 (11.18%) - 13 (13%)Provides thorough and detailed explanations for stages of hypertension, current medications and the impact of the disease in the U.S. population. Information is scientifically sound, supported and sufficient. | Points Range:9.49 (9.49%) - 11.05 (11.05%)Provides mostly sufficient explanations for stage of hypertension, current medications and the impact of the disease in the U.S. population. Information is mostly scientifically sound, support and sufficient. | Points Range:7.8 (7.8%) - 9.36 (9.36%)Provides insufficient explanations. Information is not entirely scientifically sound, necessary and sufficient. Does not address the context sufficiently or with sound rationale. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.67 (7.67%)Does not answer or incorrectly explains content. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient. |
| **Lipid Panel** | Points Range:11.18 (11.18%) - 13 (13%)Thoroughly details other conditions from the lipid panel with expert rationale and supported reasoning. Correlates lipid panel to hypertension and Type II diabetes mellitus. Correctly suggests other medication that should be given. Rationale is thorough, supported and sufficient. | Points Range:9.49 (9.49%) - 11.05 (11.05%)Provides some details regarding other conditions from the lipid panel with rationale and reasoning, although may be limited in certain areas. Mostly correlates lipid panel to hypertension and Type II diabetes mellitus. Suggests other medication that should be given but may be erroneous in some areas. Rationale is supported and mostly sufficient. | Points Range:7.8 (7.8%) - 9.36 (9.36%)Provides insufficient explanations of lipid panel rationale and correlation to disease and medication. Information is not entirely scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.67 (7.67%)Does not or incorrect answers with insufficient explanations. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient |
| **Lab Values** | Points Range:11.18 (11.18%) - 13 (13%)Provides thorough and insightful explanations for lab values, specifically HbA1c, along with the rationale in relation to normal/abnormal body function. Information is scientifically sound, supported and sufficient in detail. | Points Range:9.49 (9.49%) - 11.05 (11.05%)Provides mostly thorough explanations for lab values, specifically HbA1c, along with the rationale in relation to normal/abnormal body function. Information is mostly scientifically sound, supported but may lack detail in some areas. | Points Range:7.8 (7.8%) - 9.36 (9.36%)Provides insufficient explanations for lab values/HbA1c and insufficient rationale in relation to normal/abnormal body function. Does not address the context sufficiently or with sound rationale. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.67 (7.67%)Does not or incorrectly answers with insufficient explanations. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient. |
| **Overall Clinical findings and case analysis/Summary** | Points Range:10.32 (10.32%) - 12 (12%)Provides an overall thorough case analysis with clinical findings on case. Clinical findings are supported with evidence, compared and rationalized thoroughly. The type of heart failure is explained and supported. | Points Range:8.76 (8.76%) - 10.2 (10.2%)Provides an overall case analysis with clinical findings on case. Clinical findings are mostly supported with evidence, compared and rationalized with some evidence of critical thinking. The type of heart failure is explained and supported. | Points Range:7.2 (7.2%) - 8.64 (8.64%)Provides a limited overall case analysis with limited clinical findings on case, there is little to no support of clinical findings with evidence. The type of heart failure is not explained and/or not supported. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 7.08 (7.08%)Does not or incorrectly analyzes case with insufficient explanations and analysis. Information is not scientifically sound, necessary or sufficient or no analysis is present. |
| **Mechanics** | Points Range:6.88 (6.88%) - 8 (8%)Answers are well written throughout. Information is well organized and clearly communicated.The writing is free of spelling and grammatical errors. | Points Range:5.84 (5.84%) - 6.8 (6.8%)Answers are well written throughout and the information is reasonably organized and communicated. It is mostly free of spelling and grammatical errors. | Points Range:4.8 (4.8%) - 5.76 (5.76%)Answers are somewhat organized and lacks some clarity. Contains some spelling and grammatical errors | Points Range:0 (0%) - 4.72 (4.72%)Answers are not well written and the information is poorly organized and lacks clarity. It contains many spelling and grammatical errors |
| **APA format and References** | Points Range:8.6 (8.6%) - 10 (10%)Meets all the requirements related to length. There is a minimum of 3 scholarly resources with at least 1 non-internet source. All references are correctly cited in APA format. The student shows a solid grasp of APA formatting, paraphrasing and citations. | Points Range:7.3 (7.3%) - 8.5 (8.5%)Meets most of the requirements related to length. There is a minimum of 3 resources with at least 1 non-internet source; the references may be questionable or not scholarly in nature. Most references are correctly cited in APA format. The student shows a good grasp of APA formatting, paraphrasing and citations but needs refinement in some areas. | Points Range:6 (6%) - 7.2 (7.2%)Meets some of the requirements related to length but is lacking enough to impede the meaning of the paper. The references do not meet required count and/or may be questionable or not scholarly in nature. References are not correctly cited in APA format. The student does not show a good grasp of APA formatting, paraphrasing and citations. | Points Range:0 (0%) - 5.9 (5.9%)Does not follow format, length and layout requirements. References are not present or do not support scholarly intention. A lack of effort it apparent. There are extensive errors in formatting. |
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