Example assessment & marking criteria

Business case

# Business case example

This assessment task description and marking criteria and standards have been developed using the steps outlined on the [marking criteria and rubrics site](https://www.csu.edu.au/division/learning-teaching/assessments/rubrics-and-marking-criteria).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment type:** | **Business case** |
| **Subject:** | **HSM406 Resourcing Health and Aged Services**Students are introduced to the processes of funding health and aged care without a presumed knowledge of accounting or finance. The development of different approaches to funding to address issues of equity, efficiency and effectiveness are examined. A consideration of likely developments, at different levels and types of organisation, is linked to pressures for reform in performance. Students will develop an ability to link analysis of performance with the principles of clinical governance to focus on an improvement in the quality of service delivery. |
| **Subject learning outcomes:** | Upon successful completion of this subject, students should:* be able to describe different approaches to the funding of health or aged care services used by governments;
* be able to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of different funding models used by governments, including historical, per capita and output models;
* be able to discuss recent reforms in funding of health or aged services, including government funding, non-government funding and user pay components;
* be able to understand accounting concepts and financial management issues, such as accounting for overheads, capital assets, short and long term liabilities and depreciation;
* be able to describe the strategic importance of information as a resource for health service managers;
* be able to assess the implications of the concept of clinical governance and the processes required to develop and implement it within your own organisational context;
* be able to demonstrate an ability to integrate their understanding of resource management principles through the development of a business case requiring resource investment.
 |
| **Assessment task:** | Assessment task 2. Clinical Governance Business Case |
| **Value & length:** | 45%, 4000 words |
| **Task description:** | Develop a business case that requires a financial commitment and resource investment for a project that is closely related to your area of work concerning a matter of clinical governance. You must balance an emphasis between quantitative data (numbers and financial data) and qualitative or descriptive (textual) data - that means something approximating 50:50. If you are not currently working in a position that has a direct linkage to clinical/clinical support/technical service delivery you should negotiate with the Subject Coordinator a proposal that addresses an issue of administrative or managerial importance that incorporates an audit and assessment of effective practice.The business case must contain the following sections:* An Executive Summary **(approx. 600 words)** - short, concise summary of the entire business case principally in your own words, including the main argument and the main implications without the detail. Short statements using sub-headings (eg. case for change, project scope/implementation, option identification/analysis and recommendation) are appropriate **(15%)**.
* The Case for Change **(approx. 800 words)** argues for and justifies the proposal, addressing one or more of the six elements of clinical governance, including a rationale for change **(20%)**.
* The Proposal itself **(approx. 1200 words)**. Identifies the proposal itself, its scope, its main elements, the relationship with clinical governance, and its boundaries **(30%)**.
* Options assessment **(approx. 1200 words)**. This must include a structured analysis (eg. cost-benefit) for each option as well as a risk analysis for each option followed by risk management strategies for the recommended option only **(30%)**.
* Recommendation **(approx. 200 words)**. This should summarise the recommended option and the monitoring/evaluation framework proposed to ensure the change objectives are realised **(5%)**.
* List of references and appendices referred to within the case itself. Appendices should be used to provide any detailed analysis or data that would otherwise clutter the main submission. Marks will be deducted if the reference list and appendices are not presented adequately.
 |
| **Rationale**: | This assignment provides an opportunity for you to demonstrate an ability to identify a clinical governance issue and to then integrate management of clinical or business activities with a systematic approach to the use of performance improvement strategies. This assessment item will address Learning Outcomes 6 and 7. |

## Marking criteria & standards

Developed by David Ritchie

Your performance in this assignment will be assessed against the weightings provided for each section of the task. You are required to demonstrate an understanding of the processes of developing and presenting a business case for improving performance within your work context and that means using numerical as well as descriptive or text-based information. To enhance the academic integrity of your case it is important to undertake additional research for appropriate resources to support your response - you must use numbers as well as text and not rely solely on text. Independent research and the use and interpretation of a variety of literatures to substantiate your response will be linked to higher performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **HD** | **DI** | **CR** | **PS** | **FL** |
| **Executive Summary** – a short, concise summary of the entire business case. | A clear and succinct summary of the business case, using sub-headings. Includes the main argument, implications and recommendation but without the detail. Up to **5.5 marks** | A clear summary of the business case, using sub-headings. Includes the main argument, implications and recommendation but without the detail. Up to **4.6 marks** | A clear summary of the business case. Includes the main argument, implications and recommendation but without the detail. Up to **4.0 marks** | A summary of the business case. Up to **3.5 marks** | An introduction without summarising the business case structure, arguments or recommendation. Up to **2.5 marks** |
| **Case for Change** – argues for and justifies the proposal, addressing one or more of the six elements of clinical governance, including a rationale for change. | A clear, succinct and critical analysis of environmental and budget influences impacting on the quality of clinical service delivery. Effective use of graphs to present critical trends of concern. Appropriately uses a clinical governance framework to identify and prioritise the factors requiring change to improve performance. Up to **9.0 marks** | A clear and succinct analysis of environmental and budget influences impacting on the quality of clinical service delivery. Effective use of graphs to present critical trends of concern. Appropriately uses a clinical governance framework to identify and prioritise the factors requiring change to improve performance. Up to **7.5 marks** | Analysis of environmental and budget influences impacting on the quality of clinical service delivery. Use of graphs and tables to highlight areas of concern. Uses a clinical governance framework to identify the factors requiring change to improve performance. Up to **6.5 marks** | Description of environmental and budget influences impacting on the quality of clinical service delivery. Use of graphs and tables to support concerns regarding performance. Describes clinical governance principles and identifies a factor requiring change to improve performance. Up to **5.75 marks** | Description of environmental and budget influences impacting on the quality of clinical service delivery. Relies on description rather than analysis based on graphs or tables to support concerns regarding performance. Describes clinical governance principles and identifies a factor requiring change to improve performance. Up to **4.25 marks** |
| **The Proposal** – identifies the proposal, scope, main elements, relationship with clinical governance and its boundaries | A clear and succinct identification of a change in resources that will improve the quality of clinical delivery. Clearly and succinctly justifies a capital investment based on the case for change analysis. Clearly identifies the scope, main elements and the priorities for change within a clinical governance framework. Clearly establishes the boundaries of the business case proposal and how the change will be evaluated. Up to **13.0 marks** | A clear and succinct identification of a change in resources that will improve the quality of clinical delivery. Justifies a capital investment based on the case for change analysis. Clearly identifies the scope, main elements and the priorities for change within a clinical governance framework. Clearly establishes the boundaries of the business case proposal. Up to **11.0 marks** | Discusses the change in resources that will improve the quality of clinical delivery. Discusses the capital investment based on the case for change analysis. Identifies the scope, main elements and the priorities for change within a clinical governance framework. Establishes the boundaries of the business case proposal. Up to **9.5 marks** | Describes the change in resources that will improve the quality of clinical delivery. Describes a capital investment based on the case for change analysis. Identifies the scope, main elements and the priorities for change within a clinical governance framework. Up to **8.25 marks** | Describes the change in resources that will improve the quality of clinical delivery. Identifies the scope and main elements for change within a clinical governance framework. Up to **6.0 marks** |
| **Options Assessment** – includes a structured analysis (eg. Cost-benefit) for each option, as well as a risk analysis for each option followed by risk management strategies for the recommended option only. | A clear and succinct analysis of more than three options, justified as resource changes within a clinical governance framework. Includes a structured financial and risk analysis for each option. Includes an evidence-based risk management strategy linked to the evaluation design to ensure the changes have a positive impact on the quality of service delivery. Includes a calculation of break-even return on investment for all options. Up to **13.0 marks** | Analysis of more than two options, justified as resource changes within a clinical governance framework. Includes a structured financial and risk analysis for at least two options. Includes an evidence-based risk management strategy linked to the evaluation design to ensure the changes have a positive impact on the quality of service delivery. Includes a calculation of break-even return on investment for at least two options. Up to **11.0 marks** | Analysis of more than two options. Includes a structured financial and risk analysis for at least two options. Includes an evidence-based risk management strategy. Includes a calculation of break-even return on investment for one option. Up to **9.5 marks** | Analysis of more than two options. Includes some financial and risk analysis. Includes an evidence-based risk management strategy. Up to **8.25 marks** | Analysis of more than two options. Includes some financial and risk analysis. Up to **6.0 marks** |
| **Recommendation** – should summarise the recommended option and the monitoring/evaluation framework proposed to ensure the change objectives are realised. Should justify the selection of the recommendation. | A clear and succinct recommendation based on options analysis that demonstrates an understanding of resource management principles. Up to **2.5 marks** | A clear recommendation based on options analysis that demonstrates an understanding of resource management principles. Up to **1.75 marks** | A recommendation based on options analysis with justification. Up to **1.5 marks** | A recommendation based on options analysis. Up to **1.5 marks** | A recommendation without explicit justification. Up to **0.75 marks** |
| **Assignment presentation** includes appropriate use of learning resources provided, as well as any additional research, citation and APA (6th) referencing. | Located, evaluated and synthesised highly relevant information from subject and local sources that substantially supported your profile. Accurately and consistently adhered to APA (6th) referencing conventions in both in text referencing and the reference list. Up to **2 marks** | Located, evaluated and synthesised relevant information from subject and local sources that supported your profile. Almost always accurately and consistently adhered to APA (6th) referencing conventions in both in text referencing and the reference list. Up to **1.75 marks** | Located, evaluated and incorporated a range of relevant information from subject and local sources that supported your profile. Accurately adhered to APA (6th) referencing conventions in both in text referencing and the reference list. Up to **1.5 marks** | Located and collated partly relevant information from subject and local sources that provided some support for your profile. Attempt made to adhere to APA (6th) referencing conventions in both in text referencing and the reference list, but with errors. Up to **1.25 marks** | Used information from sources that are tenuously related to your topic. Did not adhere to APA (6th) referencing conventions in both in text referencing and the reference list. Up to **0.75 marks** |