

## 400870 PHS REPORT: Case Study Marking Criteria

|                                 | High Distinction   | Distinction  | Credit  | Pass   | Unsatisfactory 1   | Unsatisfactory 2  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Health issue (10 marks)         | Presentation of the health issue is comprehensive and balanced and the writing integrates the most relevant, recent evidence and data from quality sources.  | Presentation of the health issues is informative and balanced and the writing integrates relevant, recent evidence and data from quality sources.  | Presentation of the health issues is informative and balanced. The writing is clear and includes most relevant and recent evidence or data from quality sources.                        | Presentation of the health issues is adequate. The writing is clear but might not include, or clearly describe, some relevant and recent evidence or data. Sources may not be best evidence but are reputable.                     | Presentation of the health issues is not adequate and might be difficult to read. It does not describe or include relevant and recent evidence or data. Sources may not be reputable.                  | Presentation of the health issues does not include, or describe, relevant and recent evidence or data, or can not be understood. Sources are not reputable.             |
| Determinants (20 marks)         | Identification and writing about determinants is comprehensive, balanced, accurate and well-reasoned with relevant high quality evidence.  | Identification and writing about determinants is balanced, appropriate and well-reasoned with relevant quality evidence.   | Identification and writing about determinants is mostly well-reasoned with relevant quality evidence but may be less concise or complete.   | Identification and writing about determinants is adequately reasoned with relevant evidence but may not be complete or has inaccuracies. Sources may not be best evidence but are reputable.                                       | Identification of determinants is inadequately reasoned with relevant evidence and is incomplete or inaccurate. Writing style may interfere with meaning and evidence sources are not reputable.       | Determinants have not been identified or are inaccurate. Evidence sources are not used or reputable. Writing style is not readable.                                     |
| Services (20 marks)             | The outline is comprehensively and accurately representative of locally available services and their place in the Australian health hierarchy.   | The outline is broad, balanced and accurately representative of locally available services and their place in the Australian health system hierarchy.  | The outline is mostly balanced and accurately representative of locally available services and their place in the Australian health system hierarchy.                                   | The outline is reasonably representative of the locally available services and place in the Australian health system hierarchy, but there may be some omissions or errors.   | The outline is not representative of the locally available services and/or their place in the Australian health system hierarchy due to some major omissions or errors.                                | The outline is not representative of the locally available services and/or their place in the Australian health system hierarchy due to many major omissions or errors. |
| Analysis of services (20 marks) | The analysis comprehensively outlines how the health services address the range of social and environmental determinants, using only relevant quality evidence.  | The analysis outlines how most health services address the social and environmental determinants using relevant quality evidence.  | The analysis outlines how most health services address the social and environmental determinants. The work may include some descriptive information but uses relevant quality evidence. | The analysis outlines how some health services address the social and environmental determinants. The work may be partially descriptive but most evidence is relevant and reputable.   | There is inadequate analysis of how health services address the social and environmental determinants. The work may be largely descriptive and evidence might not be relevant or reputable.            | There is no analysis of how health services address the social and environmental determinants. The work is descriptive and evidence is not relevant or reputable.       |
| Recommendation (10 marks)       | The recommendations demonstrate full and critical consideration of the health scenario, determinants, system and services. They are meaningful, consistent with previous analyses and are wholly evidence-based. | The recommendations demonstrate critical consideration of the health scenario, determinants, system and services. They are meaningful, consistent with previous analyses and are evidence-based. | The recommendations mostly demonstrate consideration of the health scenario, determinants, system and services. They are consistent with previous analyses and are evidence-based.      | Some reasonable recommendations demonstrate an attempt to critically consider the health scenario, determinants, system and services. There may be some inconsistency with previous analyses but are mostly derived from evidence. | The recommendations are inadequate or incorrect. They may be unclear or inconsistent with the health scenario, determinants, system and services, and are not derived from sound analyses or evidence. | There is no recommendation with consideration of the health scenario, determinants, system and services. It is not derived from sound analysis or evidence.             |
| Technical (10 marks)            | Excellent spelling, grammar and punctuation that contribute to quality of expression. All formatting requirements are met.   | Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation with one minor error. All formatting requirements are met.  | Mostly accurate spelling, grammar, punctuation and/or formatting with one or two minor errors.  | There are a few spelling, grammar, punctuation and/or formatting errors that do not interfere with reading or meaning.   | Spelling, grammar and/or punctuation errors interfere with reading or meaning. There may be more than one formatting errors.   | Spelling, grammar and/or punctuation errors significantly interfere with reading or meaning. Formatting requirements have not been used.                                |

## 400870 PHS REPORT: Case Study Marking Criteria

|                       | High Distinction   | Distinction   | Credit  | Pass   | Unsatisfactory 1   | Unsatisfactory 2  |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| References (10 marks) | APA 7th edition referencing is used appropriately throughout the essay and reference list. | APA 7th edition referencing is used appropriately throughout the essay and reference list with one minor type of error. | APA 7th edition referencing is mostly appropriate throughout the essay and reference list with two minor types of errors. | APA 7th edition referencing is mostly appropriate throughout the essay and reference list with a few errors. | There are a few major APA 7th edition referencing errors in the essay and reference list that affect readability or meaning. | APA 7th edition has not been used or has multiple major errors that affect readability and reading. |