



Candidate Code:	
Who the report is about:	
Who the report is addressed to:	

This report would concern an issue such as an assessment of the work-relatedness of a major illness or birth defect, a dispute regarding a worker's capacity for work, unfair employment discrimination.

To reach level 3 (expected standard): The candidate is expected to meet 80% of the individual criteria – in each column – across all areas of the report that are assessed.

ASSESSMENT DOMAINS	IDENTIFICATION OF PURPOSE OF REPORT AND RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS	STRUCTURE, LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR WITHIN THE REPORT	DESCRIPTION OF HISTORY AND DOCUMENTATION OF RELEVANT CLINICAL EXAMINATION FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF ANY INVESTIGATIONS	INTERPRETATION AND SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND PRIORITISATION OF ISSUES	CONCLUSION AND OPINION
LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE 4 Excellent Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds the expected standard. Also outlines the constraints/limitations of the review and report and associated with an independent medical assessment. Identifies any ethical issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds expected standard. Appropriate Headings. Fluent history with good flow when reading the report. Avoids non-pertinent information. Internally consistent. No spelling mistakes. Grammatically correct Easy to understand with appropriate language for the reader. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis on appropriate details. Relevant negative examination findings (special test appropriate to the concerns). Exceeds expected standard. History is structured, succinct and accurate. Highly structured, succinct and accurate clinical findings. Good synthesis and interpretation of any investigations. Appropriate emphasis on core issues. Able to elaborate on pertinent concerns. Clarity on pertinent positive or negative history. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds expected standard. Confidently identifies essential problems/issues. Identifies most likely diagnosis and provides reasonable differential diagnosis where applicable, based on history and clinical examination. Correctly interprets findings, and presents in structured and easy-to-follow manner. Careful prioritisation of problems, which includes a long-term view. Clearly identifies and understands the workplace and cultural issues. Identifies if further information required in order to provide a report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly interprets findings. Recognises and discusses areas of doubt. References appropriate material to support conclusion and management. Discusses further workplace management and conflicts. Superior summary and discussion of case, including overall good management. Application of relevant legislation to facilitate case management.

<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">3</p> <p style="font-weight: bold;">Expected Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines the role of author and purpose of the assessment (e.g. treating doctor, impairment assessment, fitness for work assessment etc.). • Identifies who the report is going to. • Identifies the purpose of the referral. • Identifies relevant legislation that applies to the case. • Obtains appropriate consent. • Provides opinion within area of practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate Headings. • History with sufficient flow. • Minimal spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably complete, accurate and detailed history. • Complete and relevant clinical examination findings. • Comments on the results of any relevant investigations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides appropriate interpretation of history and clinical findings. • Identifies the key problems/issues. • Provides sensible diagnosis where applicable. • Identifies or discusses appropriate alternative diagnoses. • Identifies and understands the workplace issues. Recognises when commentary will be outside of area of expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly interprets findings • Recognises and discusses areas of doubt • Able to discuss further workplace management and conflicts • Acceptable summary and discussion of case, including good management. Recognises when commentary is outside of area of practice.
<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">2</p> <p style="font-weight: bold;">Below Expected Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not outline reports provided to be reviewed. • Poor review of enclosed documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of structure in report. • Spelling mistakes. • Poor grammar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History incomplete, inadequately detailed and / or inaccurate history (misses essential elements of history). • Fails to mention some important negative findings in the history. • Minimal or no comment on the results of any investigations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides inappropriate interpretation of history and clinical findings. • Problems poorly prioritised. • Significant problems/issues undervalued or missed. • Has difficulty providing sensible diagnosis. • Has difficulty discussing appropriate alternative diagnoses. • Has difficulty clearly identifying or understanding the workplace issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrectly interprets some findings. • Unable to recognise and discuss areas of doubt. • Able to discuss only some workplace management. • Difficulty resolving any conflicts.
<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">1</p> <p style="font-weight: bold;">Well Below Expected Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not outline purpose or understanding of the report. • No consent obtained for the consultation and reporting. • Does not state who the report is going to. • Does not have statement regarding role of independent assessor vs treating doctor. • Does not confirm consent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of or no clear structure in report. • Spelling mistakes. • Poor grammar. • Repetitive, poorly structured. • Poor language and bad grammar/syntax. • Report brief and not fit for purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omission of many key or essential elements of history. • Inaccuracies or lack of detail. • Historical details not clarified. • Minimal detail. • Examination brief. • No comment on the results of investigations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor or no understanding or identification of significant problems/issues. • Unable to suggest a reasonable diagnosis. • Requires substantial prompting. • Unable to consider additional information that may alter diagnosis. • Has not considered any workplace issues or impact. • No attempt to establish any priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrectly interprets most findings. • Unable to recognise and discuss areas of doubt. • Unable to discuss workplace management. • Does not recognise any conflicts. • Difficulty resolving any conflicts that may be present.

Overall rating			
Well below expected standard	Below expected standard	Reaches expected standard	Reaches excellent standard

Additional Comments
<p><i>Note for Assessors: Feedback is required if the trainee performs 'below' or 'well below' expected standard. Be specific and constructive in your comments. Comments should link to rubric domains and focus on improvement.</i></p>