



RACP
Specialists. Together

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
Public Health Medicine

MARKING GUIDE FOR WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Instructions to assessors

- The design of the marking form is intended to be flexible enough to accommodate different types of Workplace Report. For certain types of reports, such as a 'Fact Sheet', trainees have been asked to submit supplementary material.
- The marking form consists of a series of scales (*Below expected standard, Meets expected standard, Exceeds expected standard*) that are used to address the various assessment areas of the report. The eight areas to be covered are:
 1. Abstract
 2. Introduction/background/rationale
 3. Aims/objectives/purpose of the project
 4. Study design and methods
 5. Analysis of data/synthesis of information
 6. Results/findings
 7. Discussion and conclusions
 8. Format of the report
- Please check the box for the rating that most closely represents your assessment for each area. Check one box only for each area.
- For areas 7 and 8 there are several sub-sections, and you are therefore also asked to provide a summary rating for 7 and 8.
- The areas to be assessed are stated in broad terms and should generally be covered, either in the report itself or in any supplementary material provided. Provision is made for Not Applicable (N/A), to allow for exceptional cases of non-standard reports, such as grant proposals.
- Based on your assessment of the eight areas, please make a judgment of the overall standard of the report (*Below expected standard, Meets expected standard, Exceeds expected standard*). For example, if a trainee is below expected standard in one area but has met or exceeded the expected standard in all other areas, you may decide that the trainee has met the standard overall.
- **Please take the time to provide comments** for each area on the marking form, as well as in the 'Overall comments' section. These comments will be used to provide feedback to candidates, so please try to make them constructive. The comments are particularly important when providing feedback to candidates who may need to resubmit a report.



RACP
Specialists. Together

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Trainee Name: <enter>

Date: <enter>

Name of Assessor: <enter>

Report Title: <enter>

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	Comments
1. Abstract				
Concise summary of project, including background, aims, methods, results, conclusions	Abstract is poorly organised, uninformative <input type="checkbox"/>	Abstract is a reasonable summary with minor omissions and/or excess detail <input type="checkbox"/>	Abstract is concise, well organised, contains essential information <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Introduction/background/rationale				
Clear introduction including rationale; placement of project in context; discussion of relevant literature as appropriate	Limited background given; project poorly placed in context of existing knowledge; inadequate reference to existing literature <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant background information; clear rationale; project placed in context of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant aspects of context and background well described; particularly good discussion of literature and articulation of rationale for project <input type="checkbox"/>	



RACP
Specialists. Together

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Trainee Name: <enter>

Date: <enter>

Name of Assessor: <enter>

Report Title: <enter>

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	Comments
3. Aims/objectives/purpose of the project				
Aims/objectives/purpose of the project clearly articulated	Aims/objectives/purpose of project not given or poorly articulated <input type="checkbox"/>	Aims/objectives/purpose clearly articulated <input type="checkbox"/>	Aims/objectives/purpose particularly well-articulated <input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Study design and methods				
<i>An appropriate public health approach/ methodology is used and clearly described (e.g. Health Impact Assessment, outbreak investigation, policy analysis)</i>	Approach/methodology inappropriate or of limited validity; and/or inadequately described <input type="checkbox"/>	Approach/methodology appropriate and adequately described <input type="checkbox"/>	Approach/methodology appropriate and particularly well described <input type="checkbox"/>	



RACP
Specialists. Together
 EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Trainee Name: <enter>	Date: <enter>
Name of Assessor: <enter>	
Report Title: <enter>	

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	Comments
5. Analysis of data or synthesis of information				
Analysis of data or synthesis of information appropriate for the nature of the project	Analysis and/or synthesis inappropriate or inadequate <input type="checkbox"/>	Analysis and/or synthesis appropriate and correct <input type="checkbox"/>	Analysis and/or synthesis appropriate and particularly well conducted <input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Results/findings				
Results/findings clearly and concisely presented	Results/findings incomplete or poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant results/findings concisely and clearly presented (graphs and/ or tables as appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant results/findings particularly well presented, including high quality graphs and tables as appropriate <input type="checkbox"/>	



RACP
Specialists. Together
 EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Trainee Name: <enter>

Date: <enter>

Name of Assessor: <enter>

Report Title: <enter>

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	Comments
7. Discussion and conclusions				
7a. Main findings and interpretation of results Findings and conclusions are clearly and logically stated, supported by the body of the report	Main findings not clear; inadequate interpretation of the results; conclusions not supported by the body of the report <input type="checkbox"/>	Main findings adequately presented; conclusions clearly and logically stated and supported by the body of the report <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good account of main findings and conclusions, supported by the body of the report <input type="checkbox"/>	
7b. Discussion Placement of findings in context of other relevant literature	Demonstrates little understanding of the meaning of the findings in relation to other evidence <input type="checkbox"/>	Findings adequately discussed in relation to other evidence <input type="checkbox"/>	Findings particularly well discussed in relation to other evidence <input type="checkbox"/>	
7c. Limitations of the project	Demonstrates little or no understanding of the limitations of the project <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the limitations of the project <input type="checkbox"/>	Addresses well the limitations of the project <input type="checkbox"/>	
7d. Implications for Public Health practice, including recommendations (if appropriate)	Demonstrates little or no understanding of implications of project for Public Health practice <input type="checkbox"/>	Implications for Public Health practice clearly stated; includes recommendations (where appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/>	Implications for Public Health practice particularly well articulated; includes recommendations (where appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Summary Rating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



RACP
Specialists. Together
 EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Trainee Number: <enter>	Date: <enter>
Name of Assessor: <enter>	
Report Title: <enter>	

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	Comments
8. Format of the report				
<i>8a. Writing style/presentation</i> Includes report organisation, grammar and spelling, typographical errors	Report poorly organised; meaning obscured at times by poor expression; much incorrect grammar and spelling; many layout and/or typographical errors <input type="checkbox"/>	Report well organised; clear, fluent writing style; mostly correct grammar and spelling; few layout and/or typographical errors <input type="checkbox"/>	Report particularly well organised; particularly clear, fluent writing style; correct spelling and grammar <input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>8b. Referencing</i>	Inadequately referenced and/or non-standard format <input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriately referenced using standard format <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Summary Rating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



RACP
Specialists. Together

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of
 Public Health Medicine

WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

<p>Overall standard Based on your assessment of the eight areas, please make a judgment of the overall standard of the report.</p>		
<p>Below expected standard <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Meets expected standard <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Exceeds expected standard <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Overall comments</p>		