

MSc International Health Technology Assessment and Reimbursement (On-line): HAR689 Long project – Marking Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding 80-100%	1 st class piece of work 70-79%	Good but with faults 60-69%	Pass 50-59%	A fail 45-49%	Bad fail, poor attempt ≤44%
1. Introduction, The product and pathway: <i>Presents: Statement of the decision problem; description of the technology (including anticipated adverse events, indication); pathology and epidemiology; description and justification of comparators; existing guidance, clinical care pathway and the place of the product/technology within the pathway</i>	Outstandingly insightful description and justification of all aspects relating to the product and pathway, presented Exemplary case for therapeutic value proposition (TVP), outlined	Very good description and justification of all aspects relating to the product and pathway, presented Excellent case for TVP, defined	Good description of all or most aspects relating to the product and pathway, presented Missed one or two justifications but a good case for TVP, presented	Acceptable description of all aspects relating to the product and pathway, outlined Missed a few minor justifications but acceptable case for TVP, presented	Inadequate description aspects relating to the product and pathway, with partial descriptions justifications Case for TVP, unclear, inadequately presented	Limited or no description of the decision problem Limited or no case for TVP, presented
2. Clinical effectiveness evidence <i>Demonstrates <u>principles and methodology</u> for an SLR of clinical effectiveness (The student is not required to conduct a full systematic review, and can conduct a review of reviews or equivalent if appropriate)</i>	Clear question; principles and methodological approach appropriate, substantially justified and clearly described. Excellent identification and selection of highly relevant evidence. Sophisticated/rigorous quality assessment and analytical synthesis. Perceptive critique and summary of evidence. Excellent link to TVP.	Clear question; principles and methodological approach appropriate, well justified and clearly described Comprehensive identification and selection of relevant evidence. Excellent quality assessment and analytical synthesis. Excellent critique and summary of evidence. Very good link to TVP.	Clear question; principles and methodological approach appropriate, justified and clearly described. Good identification and selection of relevant evidence. Good quality assessment and analytical synthesis. Good critique and summary of evidence. Good link to TVP.	Basic but clear question; principles and methodological approach described, but weak, limited or no justification. Acceptable identification and selection of relevant evidence. Acceptable/basic quality assessment and analysis. Acceptable/standard critique and summary of evidence. Vague link to TVP.	Question unclear; principles and methodological approach poorly described, with weak, limited or no justification. Incomplete identification and selection of relevant evidence. Poorly explained / described quality assessment and analysis. Poorly-described critique and summary of evidence. No or vague link to TVP.	No question; principles and methodological approach not stated. Identification and selection of evidence, inappropriate or inadequate. Limited or no presentation of quality assessment or analysis. Limited or no critique and summary of evidence. No link to TVP

Criteria	Outstanding 80-100%	1 st class piece of work 70-79%	Good but with faults 60-69%	Pass 50-59%	A fail 45-49%	Bad fail, poor attempt ≤44%
3. Trials design and outcome measures	Exceptional identification of population, intervention, comparators and outcomes relevant to the study. Excellent consideration of the key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP.	Comprehensive identification of population, intervention, comparators and outcomes relevant to the study. Insightful consideration of key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP	Good identification of population, intervention, comparators and outcomes relevant to the study. Good/Appropriate consideration of key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP	Standard/acceptable identification of population, intervention, comparators and outcomes relevant to the study. Basic consideration of key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP	Casual / limited identification of population, intervention, comparators and outcomes relevant to the study. Casual / limited consideration of key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP	Very limited / no identification of population, intervention, comparators or outcomes relevant to the study. Very limited / inappropriate consideration of key elements of trial and the linkages with the evidence base, model and TVP
4. Cost effectiveness evidence <i>Demonstrate principles of cost effectiveness modelling in terms of topic and conceptual model (values and parameters)</i> <i>(The student is not expected to conduct an SLR or build and run a model)</i>	Principles and methodological approach appropriate, substantially justified and clearly described. Excellent identification and selection of highly relevant evidence. Perceptive critique and summary of relevant evidence	Principles and methodological approach appropriate, well justified and clearly described. Comprehensive identification and selection of relevant evidence. Excellent critique and summary of relevant evidence.	Principles and methodological approach appropriate, justified and described. Good identification and selection of relevant evidence. Good critique and summary of relevant evidence.	Principles and methodological approach described, but with weak, limited or no justification. Good identification and selection of relevant evidence. Acceptable/standard critique and summary of relevant evidence.	Principles and methodological approach poorly described, with weak, limited or no justification. Incomplete identification and selection of relevant evidence. Poorly explained / described critique and summary of relevant evidence.	Principles and methodological approach not stated. Identification and selection of evidence, irrelevant or inadequate. No description of critique and summary of relevant evidence.
5. Discussion <i>Present summary of the key issues relating to the TVP and considers how a submission to the two different jurisdictions being considered might impact on or affect the TVP</i>	Demonstrates an excellent knowledge and understanding of all major key issues. Sophisticated ability to integrate theory and real-world concerns (where appropriate).	Demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of all major key issues. Insightful ability to integrate theory and real-world concerns (where appropriate).	Demonstrates an adequate knowledge and understanding of the important issues. Satisfactory ability to relate research and real-world concerns (where appropriate).	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the important issues with some gaps or inadequacies. Occasional limited ability to relate research and real-world	Demonstrates poor understanding of the important issues. Very limited ability to relate research and real-world concerns (where appropriate). Unimportant issues relating to the topic	Demonstrates little or no understanding of the important issues; Inability to make meaningful connections between research and real-world concerns (where appropriate).

Criteria	Outstanding 80-100%	1st class piece of work 70-79%	Good but with faults 60-69%	Pass 50-59%	A fail 45-49%	Bad fail, poor attempt ≤44%
	All or common major issues required for the topic identified and addressed satisfactorily. No errors of fact or interpretation.	All or common major issues required for the topic identified and addressed satisfactorily. No substantial errors of fact or interpretation.	Some major issues required for the topic identified and addressed. Few errors of fact/ interpretation of key aspects of TVP application.	concerns (where appropriate). Some major issues required for the topic missed. Some errors of fact/ interpretation indicative of misunderstandings of key aspects of TVP application.	identified and presented. Serious errors in fact/ interpretation of key aspects of TVP application.	Few, if any, of the significant issues required of the topic identified or presented. Very serious errors and/or omissions of fact/ interpretation of key aspects of TVP application.
6. Conclusions <i>Present TVP for product; identify and summarise all key elements of interest to reimbursement authorities in the relevant jurisdictions</i>	Exemplary conclusions, clearly linked to the topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; appropriate and perceptive summary, justified by evidence.	Very good conclusions, clearly linked to the topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; appropriate and insightful summary, justified by evidence.	Good conclusions, clearly linked to the topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; appropriate and well-presented summary, justified by evidence.	Acceptable conclusions, linked to the topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; adequately described, but inadequately justified by evidence.	Conclusions poorly linked to topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; inappropriate or inadequate summary, not justified by evidence.	Conclusions not linked to topic. Recommendations /opportunities for further practice or research; unclear summary, not justified by evidence.
7. Presentation of data (Tables/ Figures)	Outstanding use of Tables / Figures, correct legends. Data presentation, exemplary and easy to read/ understand	Excellent use of Tables/ Figures, correct legends. Data presentation, good and easy to read/understand	Acceptable use of Tables/ Figures, correct legends. Data presentation, acceptable and easy to read/understand	Acceptable use of Tables/ Figures, some missing or incorrect legends. Occasionally, data presentation is not concise/appropriate/ easy to read/understand	Poor use of Tables/Figures Inappropriate/un-acceptable data presentation (e.g. using Table/Figure to summarise text to reduce word count; poorly presented data etc.)	Missed opportunities to present data in Tables/ Figures
8. References	Accurate and up-to-date citations in text. Reference list, precise.	Appropriate citations in text. Reference list, precise.	Appropriate citations; minor omissions in bibliography.	Appropriate citations; minor omissions and errors in bibliography.	Missing/ incorrect citations; omissions and errors in bibliography.	No citations/ bibliography.

Criteria	Outstanding 80-100%	1st class piece of work 70-79%	Good but with faults 60-69%	Pass 50-59%	A fail 45-49%	Bad fail, poor attempt ≤44%
9. Syntax	Exemplary. Very good use of English. Coherent and easy to understand. Negligible errors	Excellent. Very effective use of English. Coherent and easy to understand. Negligible errors.	Good. Effective use of English. Coherent and easy to understand. Occasional errors/ typos.	Satisfactory. Generally, acceptable use of English. Coherent with occasionally difficult to understand due to errors/typos.	Unacceptable. Poor use of English. Difficult to read and understand.	Unacceptable Poor use of English with frequent errors/ typos. Difficult to read and understand.
10. Structure	Outstandingly organised and well-written dissertation. Module Handbook followed.	Excellent organisation of submission. Module Handbook followed.	Good organisation of submission. Occasional deviations from recommendations in Module Handbook.	Acceptable presentation. Occasional deviations from recommendations in Module Handbook.	Poor organisation and structure. Frequent deviations from recommendations in Module Handbook.	Unacceptable organisation and structure. Major deviations from recommendations in Module Handbook.