|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. ORIGINALITY** |  Mark with a X |
| -Not at all original (topic already well known and previously published) |  |
| -Not very original (topic well known with hardly any new information) |  |
| -Quite original (different nuance or novel perspective on a known topic) |  |
| -Very original (extremely novel, topic not well known, new approach) |  |
| **2. RELEVANCE:** | Mark with a X |
| -Not at all relevant (no relation to the area of interest) |  |
| -Slightly relevant |  |
| -Quite relevant |  |
| -Very relevant (related to the area of interest) |  |
| **3. STRUCTURE / SCIENTIFIC WRITING:** | Mark with a X |
| -No structuring, not very clear |  |
| -Not very structured, written in language that is not very scientific |  |
| -Lacking in a structural element, scientific language |  |
| -Clear and well-structured, follows guidelines, self-explanatory |  |
| **4. CASE STUDY:** | Mark with a X |
| -Data that is not very well organised, coherent or comprehensive |  |
| -Data that is semi-organised, coherent and comprehensive |  |
| -Data that is well organised, coherent and comprehensive |  |
| **5. DEFINITION OF PROBLEM** | Mark with a X |
| -Not defined, not suitably presented |  |
| -Not particularly well presented, imprecise |  |
| -Quite suitable and coherent as it is presented |  |
| -Well described, uses NANDA taxonomy/collaborative problem, clearly identifies the problem |  |
| **6. INTERVENTION/RESULTS:** | Mark with a X |
| -Not described, not representative of the problem defined |  |
| -Partially described, partially answers the problem defined |  |
| -Clear, accurate and answers the problem defined, uses NOC/NIC taxonomy |  |
| **7. CONCLUSIONS** | Mark with a X |
| -Not taken from the results, no relation to the problem posed |  |
| -Partially defined, unclear, some not taken from the results and the problem posed |  |
| -Clear, answers the problem posed, based on results |  |
| **8. OVERALL EVALUATION** (Remarks) |  |
|  |