HAR6111: Marking criteria

Criteria	Outstanding 80-100	1st class work 79-70	Good but with faults 69-60	Adequate pass 59-50	Fail 49-40	Bad fail, poor attempt 39-0
1. Pathway diagram (15%)						
Disease management pathway	Outstanding level of clarity and understanding. Shows all current treatments, sub-populations and differences between jurisdictions.	Excellent level of clarity and understanding. Shows all current treatments and sub-populations and differences between jurisdictions.	Good level of clarity and understanding. Shows most current treatments, sub-populations and differences between jurisdictions.	Basic level of detail and understanding. Shows some current treatments and sub-populations.	Poor understanding of the condition and management. Major treatments and sub-populations omitted.	Few details on the current treatments and sub-populations given.
Logic and flow of disease treatment pathway	Excellent rationale and logical flow from one treatment approach to the next.	Good rationale and entirely logical flow from one treatment approach to the next.	Mostly logical flow from one treatment approach to the next.	Some logical flow from one treatment approach to the next.	No logical flow.	Flow appears confused.
2. Description of management pathway (25%)						
Summary of key pathway elements	Outstanding summary of the disease, sub-populations and treatment classes.	Excellent summary of the disease, sub-populations and treatment classes.	Good summary of the disease and most sub-populations and treatment classes	Basic summary of the disease, sub-populations and key treatment classes. Some elements missing.	Poor summary. Many key sub-populations and treatment classes omitted.	No clear summary of treatment classes and sub-populations.
Consistency of description and pathway	Description fully compatible with pathway.	Descriptions compatible with pathway.	Descriptions mostly compatible with pathway.	Descriptions not always compatible with pathway.	Description poorly described and inconsistent with pathway.	Description has no logical structure.
International awareness of jurisdictions	Outstanding awareness of implications of differences between jurisdictions. Differences clear in pathway and description.	Excellent awareness of implications of differences between jurisdictions. Differences clear in pathway and description.	Good awareness of differences between jurisdictions; some consideration of implications. Main differences clear in pathway and description.	Some awareness of differences between jurisdictions. Little consideration of implications. Some differences clear in pathway and description.	Little awareness and consideration of differences between jurisdictions. Differences not clearly shown in pathway and description.	No awareness of differences between jurisdictions.
Sources of evidence and referencing	Full description of evidence sources. Appropriate referencing.	Full description of evidence sources. Appropriate referencing.	Good description of evidence sources. Appropriate referencing.	Some description of evidence sources. Some referencing.	Little description of evidence sources. Unclear referencing.	Inadequate description of evidence sources. Inadequate referencing.
3. Factors influencing positioning (10%)						

Consideration of issues for positioning of new intervention in pathway	a) Excellent understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Insightful & well informed application to clinical topic.	a) Good understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Insightful and informed application to clinical topic.	a) Clear understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Reasonably insightful application to clinical topic.	a) Basic understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Some application to clinical topic.	a) Poor understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Little or superficial application to clinical topic.	a) Little or no understanding of factors affecting positioning. b) Little or no application to clinical topic.
4. Pricing and positioning (10%)						
Consideration of the relationship between pricing and positioning	a) Excellent understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Insightful & well informed application to clinical topic.	a) Good understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Insightful & informed application to clinical topic.	a) Clear understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Reasonably insightful application to clinical topic.	a) Basic understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Some application to clinical topic.	a) Poor understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Little or superficial application to clinical topic.	a) Little or no understanding of how price and positioning affect one another b) Little or no application to clinical topic.
5. Unmet need, TVPs and trials (30%)						
Potential positionings/ TVPs for new intervention	Exceptional TVPs including relevant positions in pathway and populations.	Excellent TVPs including relevant positions in pathway and populations.	Good TVPs including mainly relevant positions in pathway and patient populations.	Adequate TVPs including fairly clear positions in pathway and patient populations.	Unsatisfactory TVPs with flaws in the positions in pathway and patient populations.	Poor TVPs and with little clarity of positions in pathway and patient populations.
Areas of unmet need	a) Excellent explanation of unmet need, fully justified. b) Entirely consistent with pathway and description	a) Good explanation of unmet need, fully justified. b) Consistent with pathway and description.	a) Clear explanation of unmet need, mostly justified. b) Mostly consistent with pathway and description.	a) Basic explanation of unmet need, partly justified. b) Partly consistent with pathway and description.	a) Little explanation of unmet need, poorly justified. b) Not consistent with pathway and description.	a) Little or no explanation of unmet need, not justified. b) Not consistent with pathway and description.
Description of trial evidence	a) Outstanding trial descriptions with relevant population, intervention, comparators and outcomes. b) Consistent with pathway and addresses unmet needs.	a) Excellent trial descriptions with relevant population, intervention, comparators and outcomes. b) Consistent with pathway and addresses unmet needs.	a) Good trial descriptions with mainly relevant population, intervention, comparators and outcomes. b) Mostly consistent with pathway and addresses unmet needs.	a) Adequate trial descriptions with some relevant populations, interventions, comparators and outcomes. b) Partially consistent with pathway, partly addresses unmet needs.	a) Poor trial descriptions with few relevant populations, interventions, comparators and outcomes. b) Not always consistent with pathway, does not address unmet needs.	a) Inadequate trial descriptions. b) Inconsistent with pathway, does not address unmet needs
6. Evidence to demonstrate value (10%)						
Description of non-trial evidence to demonstrate cost-effectiveness	a) Outstanding consideration of all types of evidence. b) Outstanding description of sources.	a) Excellent consideration of most key types of evidence. b) Excellent description of sources.	a) Good consideration of key types of evidence. b) Good description of sources.	a) Adequate consideration of some types of evidence b) Some description of sources.	a) Poor consideration of types of evidence. b) Poor description of sources.	a) Little or no consideration of types of evidence. b) Little or no description of sources.