**Written Communications Portfolio**

**WORKPLACE ASSESSMENT REPORT - MARKERS RATING FORM**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***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.* |
| **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.* What issue led to the need for the report and how and when did that arise?
* Purpose of report.
* Those immediately involved.
* The name and status of the person for whom the report was prepared.
* Constraints – what processes/sites were included and what related ones weren’t.
* Ethical issues that affected what were done or who was involved.
 | [ ] [ ] [ ]  | Reachesaccepted standardJust short of expected standardWell short of expected standard |   |
| **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.
* Abbreviations (e.g. for organisations or units of measurement) and necessary specialist terms explained.
* Flow of ideas that assists a reader’s understanding.
* Helpful headings and paragraphs. Clear, useful tables. Executive summary.
* Photographs or diagrams where appropriate.
* Avoidance of clutter or unhelpful information.
 | [ ] [ ] [ ]  | Reachesaccepted standardJust short of expected standardWell short of expected standard |   |
| **Analysis/Appraisal**This criterion addresses the selection of observations to fit the purpose of the report, comparison of findings with relevant laws or standards, collation of and appropriate weighting of evidence according to nature of hazard or degree of risk.* Orderly statement of relevant observed information.
* Any relevant information that could *not* be obtained because of circumstances.
* Results of hygiene assessment, sick leave or other relevant records.
* Comparative reference to journals, customs, laws, standards where relevant.
* Deductions/inferences and how these were based.
 | [ ] [ ] [ ]  | Reaches accepted standard Just short of expected standardWell short of expected standard |   |
| **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 standardWell short of expected standard |   |
| **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)*  |