**Written Communications Portfolio**

**MEDICO-LEGAL REPORT - MARKERS RATING FORM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Candidate Code:*** | | | Click here to enter text. | | | |
| ***Who the report is about :*** | | | Click here to enter text. | | | |
| ***Who the report is addressed to:*** | | | Click here to enter text. | | | |
| |  | | --- | | *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.* | | | | | | | |
| **CRITERTA** | | **RATING** | | | | **COMMENTS** |
| **Context and Purpose of Report**  This criterion addresses the ‘what’, ‘why’, ‘who’ and ‘what not’ issues that will determine the emphasis and tone of the report.   * The name and status of the person *for whom* the report was prepared. * Author’s role in the situation (treater, agent for insurer, solicitor, union etc). * For what specific purpose(s) was the report sought (e.g. delayed return to work) including (where appropriate) reference to the relevant section of an Act. * The nature of previous or related reports which are referred to. * Constraints – what (maybe) relevant information was unavailable for inclusion? * Ethical issues that affected what were done or who was involved. | |  | | Reaches  accepted standard  Just short of expected standard  Well short of expected standard | | Click here to enter text. |
| **Language and Structure**  This criterion addresses how well the report serves to build understanding for the designated reader.   * English-language report of appropriate length. * Use of terminology suited to the person for whom the report was prepared (e.g. solicitor, insurance claims officer). * Necessary specialist terms and abbreviations explained. * Flow of ideas that assists a reader’s understanding. * Helpful headings and paragraphs. * Avoidance of non-pertinent information. | |  | | Reaches  accepted standard  Just short of expected standard  Well short of expected standard | | Click here to enter text. |
| **Analysis/Appraisal**  This criterion addresses the selection of observations to fit the purpose of the report.   * Orderly statement of relevant observed information (e.g. history and examination). * Results of relevant special tests or other relevant records. * Reference to published articles, algorithms, other externally sourced information where relevant. * Deductions/inferences and how these were based. | |  | | Reaches  accepted standard  Just short of expected standard  Well short of expected standard | | Click here to enter text. |
| **Conclusions and Recommendations**  This criterion concerns how well the report has addressed its purpose, whether its limitations are made explicit and whether recommendations are appropriate.   * Summary of findings. * Recommendations appropriate, practicable, and specific to the issue at hand. | |  | | Reaches  accepted standard  Just short of expected standard  Well short of expected standard | | Click here to enter text. |
| **Overall rating** | | | | | | |
| **Well short of expected standard** | **Just short of expected standard** | | | | **Reaches accepted standard** | |
|  |  | | | |  | |
| **Additional Comments**  *(explicit, careful details about candidates who perform below expected standard)*  Click here to enter text. | | | | | | |