

**University of Texas at El Paso College of Health Sciences  
Physical Therapy Program**

**PT 6116**

**Physical Therapy Capstone Project**

**Fall 2015**

**Credit Hours:** 1  
**Contact Hours:** 15

**COURSE SYLLABUS**

**Schedule:** Independent Study  
Poster Presentations Dec 10, 4-7 pm

**Capstone Instructors:**

Mark Caulkins, MD, DPT  
Loretta Dillon, PT, DPT  
Michelle Gutierrez, PT, DSc  
Celia Pechak, PT, PhD, MPH  
Eric Robertson, PT, DPT, OCS, FAAOMPT

**Course Description:**

During the final semester of the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program, students will complete an evidence-based research manuscript and poster presentation relevant to physical therapy practice. Most students will complete an evidence based report related to a patient case. Selected students, at the invitation of a core faculty member, will participate in the faculty member's original research line. All students must produce a manuscript suitable for publication in a peer-reviewed journal and a poster appropriate for presentation at a state or national conference.

**Course Objectives:**

1. Use clinical judgment and reflection to identify, monitor and enhance clinical reasoning in order to minimize errors and enhance patient outcomes. (CC-5.19, 5.20, 5.45, 5.48)
2. Apply current knowledge, theory, and professional judgment in the case presented. (CC-5.21, 5.22, 5.23)
3. Access, critically evaluate and present the literature that pertains to diagnosis, prognosis, intervention and/or outcome for the case or systematic review presented. (CC-5.21, 5.22, 5.23, 5.25)
4. Establish an effective and safe plan of care based on the best evidence for case report OR determine best evidence to answer question posed in the systematic review. (CC-5.35)
5. Present a comprehensive case study or systematic review in poster format completing all required components. (CC-5.24)

**Required Texts:**

APTA Membership

**Recommended Texts:**

Fettters L, Tilson J. Evidence Based Physical Therapy. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Company; 2012. ISBN# 978-0-2036-1716-2

Hack LM, Gwyer J. Evidence into Practice: Integrating Judgment, Values, and Research. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Company; 2013. ISBN# 978-0-8036-1808-4

Portney LG, Watkins MP. *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ; Pearson Prentice Hall: 2009. ISBN-10: 0-13-171640-9.

**Methods of Instruction:**

Individual instruction will be held with respective capstone advisor to complete the manuscript and poster presentation requirements.

**Methods of Evaluation:**

**UTEP PHYSICAL THERAPY PROGRAM GRADING SCALE**

The following letter grade scale is used for the UTEP Physical Therapy Program: Letter Grade Scale

	Numerical Grade Scale
A	90-100
B	80-89
C	75-79
F	Below 75
Reflection paper	10%
Final Manuscript	30%
Poster Presentation	30%
Poster	30%

**Course Content:** Variety of composite patient cases presented in case report or systematic review format based on students’ clinical experiences.

**Special Accommodations (ADA):**

“If you have or suspect a disability and need accommodations, you should contact the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) at 747-5148.” You can also e-mail the office at [cass@utep.edu](mailto:cass@utep.edu) or go by their office in Union Building East. For additional information, visit the CASS website at <http://sa.utep.edu/cass/>”

### **Deadlines for Capstone Project:**

- **Final draft of the manuscript** is due by **Oct 16** to the faculty advisor.
- The completed manuscript (no errors or edits needed) is due **Nov. 13**.
- The poster will be developed from this case report or systematic review. The **final draft of the poster (in electronic file) is due Nov 30** to the Capstone Advisor.
- The **final electronic file (without errors) is due Dec 4**.
- **A printed draft of the poster (2'x3' from ILC) is due to advisor on Dec. 7**.
- The final **printed poster is due to the advisor Dec 9**.

### **Poster Presentation Date:**

December 10 from 4-7pm (poster must be mounted in HSN Lobby by 3pm)

4-5pm Faculty evaluation of posters and presentations

5-7pm Posters open to campus and community

### **Reflection Paper: (10 percent of final grade)**

- Reflection paper is due **November 30, 2015**.
- Follow the writing guidelines in your student handbook to write a reflection paper on the case you selected. Based on what you learned from your case report or systematic review research, answer these questions in the body of the paper:
  1. What did the capstone project teach you with respect to best published with respect to your case or systematic review clinical question?
  2. What barriers did you find to your learning?
  3. How did this project enhance your clinical reasoning skills?
  4. How will you become a better PT based on what you learned from this capstone project?

## PT 6116 Physical Therapy Capstone Project

Read all pages as appropriate to your Capstone project. The assignments and global deadlines are found below. The instructions and rubrics for Systematic review begin on page 5, while case reports begin on page 12.

<b>CASE REPORTS</b>	
<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Student</b>
Dr Eric Robertson	Arlianne Bejarano
	Ovidia Chacon
	Michael Palisoc
	Luis Ponce
Dr Mark Caulkins	Alden Amaro
	Travis Boyle
	Viviana Rios
Dr Michelle Gutierrez	Evan Kennedy
	Kristy Reilly
	Kayleigh Walts
	Ashly White
Dr Loretta Dillon	Amreen Ali
	Paul Estrada
	Sander Schiller
<b>SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS</b>	
<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Students</b>
Dr Celia Pechak	Salena Acosta, Lam Le, Sal Gomez
	Linda Chavira, Dayla Rangel, Abby Baeza
	Sara Chavez, Liz Rockwell, Jordan Leinweaver
	Rene Medina, Anthony Durant, Joey Gutierrez, HK Nguyen

**Capstone advisors will set individual deadlines per their schedules and ability to provide feedback in a timely manner. However, there will be some global deadlines for all students to follow. The first 2 deadlines this summer are below.**

### **GLOBAL DEADLINES:**

- June 19, 5 pm: Students completing case reports must send a synopsis of their case to their respective advisor
- June 19, 5 pm: Students completing the systematic reviews must submit their clinical question to Dr Pechak
- August 17, 5pm: All students must submit an outline of their project to their advisor in preparation for a brief presentation in PT 5225 Specific Populations to demonstrate that they are on target for completion of the project. Bullets must follow the content in the *PTJ* instruction to authors for Case Reports or Systematic Reviews. All students must be prepared to present August 24.
- December 10, 3-7 pm: Capstone Presentations at HSN

## Systematic Review Instructions and Rubrics:

The systematic review will be completed by a team of 3 students (or 4 depending on the number of students without a case report). All students will be active in the extraction and evaluation of articles found to answer a clinical question. The team must construct a clear, concise, and answerable question that is based on a specific patient problem students encountered during the curriculum.

The team must work cohesively by setting structured objectives to complete the final product. The goal of which is for all members to contribute equally to the completion of a systematic review suitable for publication. Through using effective communication and constructive conflict resolution as necessary, the faculty expects that the team will meet all objectives in a professional manner. However, in the event a conflict cannot be resolved, the team has the power to dismiss a team member. The consequences of being dismissed from a team will delay graduation, at a minimum of one semester, for the dismissed team member. The individual will have to complete an independent project and present an oral defense in the spring semester to the satisfaction of all faculty.

The capstone project will result in a systematic review for one of the following: diagnosis, prognosis, interventions, or outcomes related to the specific patient related question to be addressed. The systematic review must include at least 10 -15 references from peer-reviewed scientific/medical journals. If there are fewer than 10 references, the project will be considered incomplete.

All students who complete the systematic review must follow the PTJ guidelines to authors found at:

[http://ptjournal.apta.org/site/misc/ifora\\_systematic\\_reviews.xhtml](http://ptjournal.apta.org/site/misc/ifora_systematic_reviews.xhtml) Read and follow all details of the instructions on the PTJ Website. The exception is that only an unmasked manuscript will be submitted to the faculty advisor; a “masked version” (or blinded version – ie, where your name and institution would not be included) does not have to be submitted. Also students do not need to submit “online-only” materials nor video for this assignment.

1. Read the review process in detail as well as the PRISMA checklist and flow diagram.
2. PRISMA requirements are found at: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>
3. The manuscript formatting instructions must be followed:
  - a. Title-follow character limits (this title will be used in the doctoral reception documents and on your graduation application)
  - b. Abstract –follow word limits and use of required subheadings
  - c. Body of manuscript-follow all instructions for word count, subheadings as stated, and for all sections as listed below:
    - i. Introduction
    - ii. Methods
    - iii. Results
    - iv. Discussion
  - d. Acknowledgments
  - e. References
  - f. Tables
  - g. Figures
  - h. Appendixes

The title page of the manuscript should have the following included:

- Title
- University of Texas at El Paso
- Authors
- Faculty Advisor
- Clinical capstone project submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the Doctor of Physical Therapy Degree.

A signature page is also required and an example will be provided by the capstone advisor or with the syllabus.

**Manuscript Rubric:** The team will submit one word processed double spaced, electronic manuscript along with any files of journal articles which are referenced.

The final document along with the signature page must be scanned and emailed to Beverly Scarborough at [bscarborough@utep.edu](mailto:bscarborough@utep.edu) along with the ppt of the poster presentation by the deadlines set by the program. This deadline is included in the deadline portion of the rubric.

Total points 100 with weight factor as below.

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Needs substantial improvement 0</b>	<b>Needs moderate improvement .5</b>	<b>Needs minor improvement 1-1.5</b>	<b>Meets standards 2</b>
Style 2 points	Correct AMA style, title page with correct format, 10-15 references, citations, inclusive sections, and subheadings	AMA ignored	several errors	few errors	no errors
Structure 2 points	Well structured & cohesive. Correct sentence structure, grammar, and spelling. Appropriate length. Appropriate transitions between paragraphs and sections.	writing structure needs major overhaul	several spelling or grammatical errors +/- or more than 2 awkward or unclear sentences	few spelling or grammatical errors +/- or 1 or 2 awkward or unclear sentences	no spelling or grammatical errors – well written and cohesive
Title 1 point	Title reflects scope of the review, no longer than 150 characters	title does not accurately reflect scope of review and longer than 150 characters	title does not accurately reflect scope of review but meets character limits	title is confusing or title is appropriate but > 150 characters (.8 pts)	no errors (1 pt)

Abstract 2 points	Abstract structure Background, Purpose, Data Sources, Study Selection, Data Extraction, Data Synthesis, Limitations, Conclusions	no subheadings, unable to summarize	summary is completed, no subheadings or inappropriate subheadings	summary is completed missing 1-2 components	well documented abstract
Introduction 2 points	Background information provides rationale for included purpose statement. Review of literature supports question or problem and is thorough and well described.	no background information and no purpose statement	little or no background information and/or poorly written purpose statement	some background information (insufficient rationale) and well-written purpose statement	well documented background information that leads to well- written purpose statement with all components supported by research literature
Methods 2 points	Includes subheadings of Data Sources and Searches, Study Selection, Data Extraction and Quality Assessment, Data Synthesis and Analysis	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing – difficult to follow and understand	most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand
Results 2 points	PRISMA guidelines followed and flowsheet is included	guidelines not followed, no flowsheet	steps missing and data missing from the flow chart	1-2 omissions from the guidelines	no omissions

Discussion 2 points	No more than 5 paragraphs, statement of principal findings, strengths and weaknesses of the studies, strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies, discusses important differences in results and meaning of the SR: possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policymakers, unanswered questions and future research reported	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing - difficult to follow and understand	most important information included with 1 or 2 exceptions	major points summarized
Meeting deadlines 1 point (individual grade)	Deadlines met throughout the 12 week internship and demonstrated timely communication with advisor and each team member.	missed more than 2 deadlines or did not communicate with advisor	missed 2 deadlines or poor communication	missed 1 deadline (.8 pts)	met all deadlines and communicated well with advisor  (1 pt)

**Total 100 points: Weight factor as follow:**

- |  |             |   |             |
|--|-------------|---|-------------|
| 1. <b>Style: 2 points max X 5</b>      | <b>= 10</b> | 5. <b>Methods: 2 points max X 7.5</b>   | <b>= 15</b> |
| 2. <b>Structure: 2 points max X 10</b> | <b>= 20</b> | 6. <b>Results: 2 points max X 10</b>    | <b>= 20</b> |
| 3. <b>Title: 1 point max X 2</b>       | <b>= 2</b>  | 7. <b>Discussion: 2 points max X 10</b> | <b>= 20</b> |
| 4. <b>Abstract 2 points max X 5</b>    | <b>= 10</b> | 8. <b>Deadlines: 1 point max X 3</b>    | <b>= 3</b>  |

## PT 6116 Grading Rubric for Poster Presentation Systematic Review

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

POINTS: \_\_\_\_\_/40

### **Poster Formatting**

Criterion	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
Title, authors, and academic advisor, and institution are centered with appropriate font	0	1	2
Conforms to AMA standards for: Citations, Tables, Figures	0	1	2
Professional quality display (eg, font size, background, color, etc)	0	1	2
Presentation is not cluttered – can easily move between sections	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

### **Content**

Criterion: Systematic review process is clearly demonstrated	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
Clear, concise, and focused research question is stated	0	1	2
Question is relevant to physical therapy practice	0	1	2
Eligibility criteria with rationale stated	0	1	2
Search strategy is comprehensive	0	1	2
Appraisal of included/excluded articles is appropriate	0	1	2
PRISMA flowchart is included as a Figure with all components included	0	1	2
Results of studies are reported	0	1	2
Primary literature is major source of information	0	1	2
Summary of evidence is reported including strength of evidence	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

**Conclusion**

<b>Criterion:</b> Appropriate conclusions provided to answer the question posed.	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
General interpretation of the results are reported	0	1	2
Limitations reported	0	1	2
References are provided	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

**Demonstrated Knowledge**

<b>Criterion</b>	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
Questions are answered logically	0	1	2
Can explain or expand upon general and specific points	0	1	2
Can “think on feet”—theorize logically when appropriate and acknowledge deficits in knowledge	0	1	2
Uses data and references appropriately to support answers	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

Deductions of up to 10 percentage points of total score will be made for unprofessional behavior that includes, but is not limited to:

- student did not arrive early to set up poster and/or was not ready to present on time
- student is not dressed professionally
- student behaves unprofessionally (eg, using cell phone while at poster, gum chewing, etc)

## Case Report Instructions and Rubrics:

The case report will be completed by one student, and will follow the PTJ “checklist for case reports focusing on intervention” found at [http://ptjournal.apta.org/site/misc/ifora\\_cr\\_checklist\\_intervention.xhtml](http://ptjournal.apta.org/site/misc/ifora_cr_checklist_intervention.xhtml). The case report must include at least 10 -15 references from peer-reviewed scientific/medical journals. If there are fewer than 10 references, the project will be considered incomplete.

Read and follow all details of the instructions on the PTJ Website. The exception is that only an unmasked manuscript will be submitted to the faculty advisor; a “masked version” (or blinded version – ie, where your name and institution would not be included) does not have to be submitted. Also students do not need to submit “online-only” materials nor video for this assignment.

1. Title-follow character limits (this title will be used in the doctoral reception documents and on your graduation application)
2. Abstract –follow word limits and use of required subheadings
3. Body of manuscript-follow all instructions for word count, subheadings as stated, and for all sections as listed below:
  - a. Background and Purpose
  - b. Case Description: Patient History and Systems Review
  - c. Clinical Impression #1
  - d. Examination
  - e. Clinical Impression #2
  - f. Intervention
  - g. Outcome
  - h. Discussion (results should be tied to the existing literature; suggestions for further research are included; author specifically summarizes at the end of the discussion what this case report adds to the existing literature & what the “take home message” is for the reader)
  - i. Acknowledgments
  - j. References
  - k. Tables and Figures
  - l. Appendices (if applicable)

The title page of the manuscript should have the following included:

- Title
- University of Texas at El Paso
- Authors
- Faculty Advisor
- Clinical capstone project submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the Doctor of Physical Therapy Degree.

A signature page is also required and an example will be provided by the capstone advisor or with the syllabus.

**Manuscript Rubric:** The student will submit one word processed double spaced, electronic manuscript along with any files of journal articles which are referenced. Total points 100 with weight factor as below.

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Needs substantial improvement 0</b>	<b>Needs moderate improvement .5</b>	<b>Needs minor improvement 1-1.5</b>	<b>Meets standards 2</b>
Style 2 points	Correct AMA style, title page with correct format, referencing, citations, inclusive sections, and subheadings	AMA ignored	several errors	few errors	no errors
Structure 2 points	Well structured & cohesive. Correct sentence structure, grammar, and spelling. Appropriate length. Appropriate transitions between paragraphs and sections.	writing structure needs major overhaul	several spelling or grammatical errors +/- or more than 2 awkward or unclear sentences	few spelling or grammatical errors +/- or 2 awkward or unclear sentences	no spelling or grammatical errors – well written and cohesive
References 2 points	Has 10-30 references from peer reviewed sources that are current and relevant; interprets and integrates the literature appropriately in the paper; cites information that requires citation.	Has less than 10 references from peer reviewed sources and/or consistently fails to interpret or integrate the literature and/or consistently fails to cite information that should be cited.	Fails to interpret or integrate the literature and/or fails to cite information that should be cited 3 times.	Fails to interpret or integrate the literature and/or fails to cite information that should be cited 1-2 times.	Meets all criteria
Title 2 points	Clearly states that the manuscript is a case report and specifically reflects measured variables; no longer than 150 characters	title does not accurately reflects topic and longer than 150 characters	title does not accurately reflect topic but meets character limits	title is confusing or title is appropriate but > 150 characters	no errors

Abstract 2 points	Abstract is complete and correctly organized by: Background and Purpose, Case Description, Outcomes, Discussion	no subheadings, unable to summarize	summary is missing more than 2 components, and/or no subheadings or inappropriate subheadings	summary is completed but missing 1-2 components	well documented abstract
Background and Purpose 2 points	Provides a scholarly discussion on the gaps in the literature that this case report helps fill; ends with a purpose statement that clearly indicates the focus of the case as it relates to the intervention (eg. 'The purpose of this case report is to describe demonstrate the use of a new intervention for...")	no background information and no purpose statement	little or no background information and/or poorly written purpose statement	some background information (insufficient rationale) and well-written purpose statement	Well documented background information that leads to well-written purpose statement with all components supported by research literature
Case Description: Patient History and Systems Review 2 points	Provides detailed demographic characteristics and history in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the patient is appropriate for the examination and intervention; explains patient/family goals for physical therapy.	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing – difficult to follow and understand	most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand
Clinical Impression #1 2 points	Clearly explains why the patient is a good candidate for the intervention, based on the data collected thus far; describes the plan for examination for further determining whether the patient is appropriate for this type of intervention.	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing – difficult to follow and understand	most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand

Examination 2 points	Describes any tests needed to confirm that the patient is appropriate for the intervention as stated in the first clinical impression; and clearly explains all examination data. Uses standardized tests and measures.	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand; uses 2 or more non-standardized tests and measures	important information missing – difficult to follow and understand; uses 1 non-standardized tests and/or measures	most important information included – easy to follow and understand & with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand; uses standardized tests and measures
Clinical Impression #2 2 points	Discusses why the patient is appropriate for use of the target intervention, based on the examination data, and describes the plan for examination to determine the outcome of the intervention, offering hypotheses about what should be observed if the intervention were to be successful.	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing - difficult to follow and understand	most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand
Intervention 2 points	Describe the intervention, including how the intervention was developed and how it was applied to the patient, in sufficient detail that others can replicate the procedure. May use tables, figures, and appendixes to enhance the detailed description. Provide the parameters of the intervention (ie, intensity, frequency, and duration) and rules for progression. State changes in treatment over time, along with the rationale for the changes. List any co-interventions that the patient may have received but that are not directly related to the purpose of the case; detailed descriptions may not be necessary.	important information missing – impossible to follow and understand	important information missing - difficult to follow and understand	most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions	all important information included – easy to follow and understand

<p>Outcome 2 points</p>	<p>Include outcome measures at the person level (eg. Outcomes related to activity or participation) in addition to any other relevant outcome measures. If not already in the examination section, provide operational definitions of the outcome measures and their purpose, and cite evidence for reliability and validity. Priority is given to validated outcome measures. If reliability and validity have not been estimated for a measure, acknowledge this, and make presumptive arguments would be reasonably reliable and valid for the purpose of the case. Present the outcomes over the time points indicated in the follow-up outcomes to baseline. Use tables and figures to enhance the description.</p>	<p>important information missing – impossible to follow and understand</p>	<p>important information missing - difficult to follow and understand</p>	<p>most important information included – easy to follow and understand with 1 or 2 exceptions</p>	<p>all important information included – easy to follow and understand</p>
<p>Discussion 2 points</p>	<p>Reflect back on how the intervention may have assisted in addressing the target problem. This should be done in the context of other co-interventions that may have been provided. The key points of development and application should be tied back to the rationale for the treatment and literature on previous treatment approaches for a similar problem. Offer suggestions for further research.</p>	<p>important information missing – impossible to follow and understand</p>	<p>important information missing - difficult to follow and understand</p>	<p>most important information included with 1 or 2 exceptions</p>	<p>all important information included – easy to follow and understand</p>
<p>Meeting deadlines 1 point</p>	<p>Deadlines met throughout the 12 week internship and demonstrated timely communication with advisor.</p>	<p>missed more than 2 deadlines or did not communicate with advisor</p>	<p>missed 2 deadlines or poor communication</p>	<p>missed 1 deadline (.8 pts)</p>	<p>met all deadlines and communicated well with advisor  (1 pt)</p>

**Total 100 points: Weight factor as follows:**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 1. <b>Style: 2 points max X 5</b>  | <b>= 10</b> |
| 2. <b>Structure: 2 points max X 5</b>  | <b>= 10</b> |
| 3. <b>References: 2 points max x 5</b>   | <b>= 10</b> |
| 4. <b>Title: 2 points max X 0.5</b>  | <b>= 1</b>  |
| 5. <b>Abstract 2 points max X 1</b>  | <b>= 5</b>  |
| 6. <b>Background and Purpose: 2 points max X 5</b>                               | <b>= 10</b> |
| 7. <b>Case Description: Patient History and Systems Review: 2 points max x 5</b> | <b>= 10</b> |
| 8. <b>Clinical Impression #1: 2 points max x 1</b>                               | <b>= 2</b>  |
| 9. <b>Examination: 2 points max x 5</b>  | <b>= 10</b> |
| 10. <b>Clinical Impression #2: 2 points max x 1</b>                              | <b>= 2</b>  |
| 11. <b>Intervention: 2 points max x 5</b>  | <b>= 10</b> |
| 12. <b>Outcome: 2 points max x 5</b>   | <b>= 10</b> |
| 13. <b>Discussion: 2 points max x 5</b>  | <b>= 10</b> |

## PT 6116 Grading Rubric for Poster Presentation Case Report

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

POINTS: \_\_\_\_\_/40

### **Poster Formatting**

Criterion	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
Title, authors, and academic advisor, and institution are centered with appropriate font	0	1	2
Conforms to AMA standards for: Citations, Tables, Figures	0	1	2
Professional quality display (eg, font size, background, color, etc)	0	1	2
Presentation is not cluttered – can easily move between sections	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

### **Content**

Criterion:	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
Sufficient background is given & clear, concise, and appropriate purpose statement is provided	0	1	2
Thorough case description provided	0	1	2
All relevant examination data are provided; includes data from standardized tests and measures that are appropriate for this patient	0	1	2
Intervention is well described, and could be replicated based on the level of description	0	1	2
Outcomes are clearly documented	0	1	2

Discussion ties the results to the rationale for the intervention and existing literature	0	1	2
Discussion offers appropriate suggestions for further research	0	1	2
Discussion specifies what this case report adds to the existing literature & explicitly summarizes the “take home message” is for the reader	0	1	2
Primary literature is major source of information	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

**Conclusion**

<b>Criterion:</b> Appropriate conclusions provided to answer the question posed.	Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation	Needs Development	Meets Expectations
General interpretation of the results are reported	0	1	2
Limitations reported	0	1	2
References are provided	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

**Demonstrated Knowledge**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory Needs Remediation</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>
Questions are answered logically	0	1	2
Can explain or expand upon general and specific points	0	1	2
Can “think on feet”—theorize logically when appropriate and acknowledge deficits in knowledge	0	1	2
Uses data and references appropriately to support answers	0	1	2
COMMENTS:			

Deductions of up to 10 percentage points of total score will be made for unprofessional behavior that includes, but is not limited to:

- student did not arrive early to set up poster and/or was not ready to present on time
- student is not dressed professionally
- student behaves unprofessionally (eg, using cell phone while at poster, gum chewing, etc)