



**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:

Report Title:

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	N/A	Comments
<b>1. Abstract</b>					
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"/>		
<b>2. Introduction/background/rationale</b>					
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>

Report Title:

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	N/A	Comments
<b>3. Aims/objectives/purpose of the project</b>					
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"/>		
<b>4. Study design and methods</b>					
<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>

Report Title:

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



**RACP**  
**Specialists. Together**

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of  
 Public Health Medicine

**WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

Trainee Name: <enter>

Date: <enter>

Report Title: <enter>

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	N/A	Comments
<b>7. Discussion and conclusions</b>					
<i>7a. Main findings and interpretation of results</i> 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	Main findings adequately presented; conclusions clearly and logically stated and supported by the body of the report	Very good account of main findings and conclusions, supported by the body of the report		
<i>7b. Discussion</i> Placement of findings in context of other relevant literature	Demonstrates little understanding of the meaning of the findings in relation to other evidence	Findings adequately discussed in relation to other evidence	Findings particularly well discussed in relation to other evidence		
<i>7c. Limitations of the project</i>	Demonstrates little or no understanding of the limitations of the project	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the limitations of the project	Addresses well the limitations of the project		
<i>7d. Implications for Public Health practice, including recommendations (if appropriate)</i>	Demonstrates little or no understanding of implications of project for Public Health practice	Implications for Public Health practice clearly stated; includes recommendations (where appropriate)	Implications for Public Health practice particularly well articulated; includes recommendations (where appropriate)		
<b>7. Summary Rating</b>					



**RACP**  
**Specialists. Together**  
 EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of  
 Public Health Medicine

**WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

Trainee Number: <enter>

Date: <enter>

Report Title: <enter>

Assessment Area	Below expected standard	Meets expected standard	Exceeds expected standard	N/A	Comments
<b>8. Format of the report</b>					
<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	Report well organised; clear, fluent writing style; mostly correct grammar and spelling; few layout and/or typographical errors	Report particularly well organised; particularly clear, fluent writing style; correct spelling and grammar		
<i>8b. Referencing</i>	Inadequately referenced and/or non-standard format	Appropriately referenced using standard format			
<b>8. Summary Rating</b>					



**RACP**  
**Specialists. Together**

EDUCATE ADVOCATE INNOVATE



Australasian Faculty of  
Public Health Medicine

**WORKPLACE REPORT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

<b>Overall standard</b> 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
<b>Overall comments</b>		