



Your trusted partner in diabetes care

Reviewer's Case Study Marking Guide

Name of Applicant:

ADEA Membership Number:

| Criteria | Marks/Comments |
|---|----------------|
| The case study is within the word limit (max 3 points) | |
| Demonstration of each education principle (Meets ADEA Core Competencies) (max 5 points) | |
| Appropriately addresses each heading identifying learning (max 10 points) | |
| Appropriate referencing using ISO 690 (max 2 points) | |
| TOTAL SCORE | |

To successfully complete the Case Study as part of the Credentialling process, applicants must achieve a score of 15 or more.

| Criteria | Marking Guide | Score and Comment |
|---|---|-------------------|
| The case study is within the word limit | 0- < 1000 or > 3000 1- < 1500 or >2500 2- < 1750 or > 2250 3- 1750 - 2250 | |
| Demonstration of each education principle (Meets ADEA Core Competencies) | 1: Provides safe, effective, client centred, and clinical care to people with diabetes. | |
| | 2: Provides safe, effective, client centred diabetes self management education. | |
| | 3: Organises and manages a diabetes service. | |
| | 4: Demonstrates professional responsibility and accountability in planning and delivering diabetes self management education and clinical care. | |
| | 5: Demonstrates leadership and acts as an advocate for diabetes education and care. | |
| 1 point for each competency met | | |
| Appropriately addresses each heading | <i>Background:</i> Adequate description and summary of the article. | |
| | <i>Case Presentation:</i> Thorough description of the case including gender and age, reason for referral, medications, medical history, social history, demographic and lifestyle factors, family history, previous diabetes knowledge, biochemistry, investigations, anthropometry, other health professional input, diet history, exercise. | |
| 1 point for each heading | | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><i>Assessment:</i> adequate description of the working diagnosis/clinical impression, and the plan for care (aims/objectives).</p> | |
| | <p><i>Management:</i> goals and expected outcomes, education provided, justification, client receptivity, referrals made and resources used. Who was involved, over how many consultation sessions and how long the consultations were, what treatment decisions were made and the reasons for them.</p> | |
| | <p><i>Review:</i> adequate description of outcome measures such as self-management behaviours (blood glucose monitoring, medication/ insulin adherence, exercise) and clinical investigations (HbA1c, weight, BMI, blood pressure) and what those outcomes were; plans for follow up and frequency, progress towards goals, factors facilitating progress and barriers preventing goals being met; other positive or negative outcomes; and an indication of how often and why the patient might continue to return for review.</p> | |
| | <p><i>Literature Review:</i> relevant review of the literature within 500 words, approx. 1 page.</p> | |
| | <p><i>Discussion:</i> succinct discussion about issues which have arisen and correctly related some background as to why they might occur.</p> | |
| | <p><i>Reflection:</i> including impact on learning within scope of practice and relevance to the ADEA Core Competencies.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <i>Strengths and Limitations:</i> Challenges and strengths have been addressed, including how the challenges might have been overcome. | |
| | <i>Conclusion:</i> has clearly and succinctly addressed the aim /objective's and key learning's. | |
| Appropriate referencing using ISO 690 | 0- Incorrect referencing 1- Correct Citations in body of text OR Correct list of references. 2- Correct Citations in body of text AND Correct list of references. | |
| TOTAL SCORE | Out of 20 | |

Reviewers Name:

Reviewers Signature:

Date: