



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

This report would concern a health issue, e.g. musculo-skeletal, psychological, respiratory or skin-related, affecting a work station or work process. The emphasis for action would relate to prevention, i.e. to changes in occupational hygiene or ergonomics, rather than to legal consequences.

To reach level 3 (Expected Standard) in a particular column, the candidate **MUST NOT** contain any elements/bullet points in a class 2 category.

To reach level 4 (Excellent Standard) in a particular column, the candidate **MUST** obtain at least 4 elements/bullet points of the class 4 category.

ASSESSMENT DOMAINS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	STRUCTURE, LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR	ACCURACY OF REPORT AND OBSERVATIONS	INTERPRETATION AND SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND PRIORITISATION OF CLINICAL ISSUES	MANAGEMENT AND DISCUSSION (INCLUDING RELEVANCE TO WORKERS)
4 Excellent Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds Level 3 but also includes: Outlines further relevant background to site visit Identifies issues/difficulties Outlines the constraints of the visit and the report Discusses appropriate legislation with relevance to the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds Level 3 but also includes: Fluent information with good flow when reading the report Avoids non-pertinent information Appropriate use of photographs Appropriate referencing where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds Level 3 but also includes: Emphasis on appropriate details/findings Clarity on pertinent concerns of results identified in the work visit Relevant issues that could not be obtained/ seen during site visit Able to elaborate on pertinent concerns or results including those that could not be obtained/seen during site visit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds Level 3 but also includes: Confident interpretation of all major and minor problems/issues Establishes structured conclusions with logical/reasoned argument Clear prioritisation of problems, which includes a long-term view Clearly identifies and understands the workplace issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceeds Level 3 but also includes: Further recognition and discussion areas of doubt References appropriate material to support conclusion and management Discusses further workplace management Clear summary and discussion of case, including overall good management. Clear relevance to relevant legislative requirements.

3	Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the purpose of the referral (e.g. reason for the visit). Identifies who the report is going to and who was involved/present during the site visit. Identifies relevant legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate headings. Information presented with sufficient flow. Minimal spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonably complete, accurate and structured, detailed commentary on worksite findings. Minimal need to clarify details. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a summary on information reviewed from the workplace e.g. hygiene results, sickness absence record, hazard assessments or other relevant records. Provides appropriate interpretation of the key problems/issues. Identifies or discusses appropriate alternative circumstances. Identifies and understands the workplace issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly interprets findings. Recognises and discusses areas of doubt. Able to discuss suitable workplace management and conflicts. Acceptable summary and discussion of case, including overall good management. Applies relevant legislative requirements.
2	Below Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only brief details regarding purpose of the report. Scant details on who the report is going to and who was involved during the site visit. No identification of legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of structure in report. Spelling mistakes. Poor grammar. Inappropriate use of photographs. Irrelevant information included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or inaccurate or poorly structured commentary on worksite findings. Some need for further clarification. Fails to document or mention some important negative findings in the history. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides inappropriate interpretation of issues/problems and poorly prioritised. Significant problems/issues undervalued or missed. Has difficulty providing sensible inferences/deductions Has difficulty discussing alternative circumstances. 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 superficial workplace management. Difficulty resolving any conflicts. No application of relevant legislation.
1	Well Below Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not outline purpose of the report. Does not state who the report is going to and who was involved during the site visit. No identification of legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of structure in report Spelling mistakes Poor grammar Repetitive. Report that is difficult to read due to lack of structure, poor language and bad grammar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly organised. Omission of many key or essential elements of history. Inaccuracies or lack of detail. Repetitive, poorly structured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor understanding or identification of significant problems. Unable to suggest a inference or deduction. Has not considered any workplace issues or impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorrectly interprets most findings. Unable to recognise and discuss areas of doubt. Unable to discuss workplace management. Difficulty resolving any conflicts. No application of relevant legislation.

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>