

Standard Descriptors for Public Health Reports

1: Standard Descriptors for Outcome of Examination of PHR

This summarises how each PHR will be graded to a pass, pass subject to corrections, pass subject to amendments or fail result.

2: Standard Descriptors for Grade Points

This summarises how each section (Background, Results etc) will be graded as satisfactory, marginal or unsatisfactory.

These Standard Descriptors should be read in conjunction with the **Public Health Report MFPHMI Part 11 Assessment Form** which sets out the requirements for a satisfactory grade in each section of the PHR and for the Oral Examination on the PHR. It also sets out how section grades (satisfactory, marginal, unsatisfactory) are compiled to provide an overall grade for the PHR.

Standard Descriptors for Outcome of examination of Public Health Report.	
Pass/Pass subject	The PHR outlines the context and examines the evidence base, and
to minor	clearly sets out aim(s) and objectives. The methods are carefully
corrections:	described and appropriate to the purpose of the investigation. The analysis presentation and description and the main conclusions are
<u>Pass</u> : the 5 areas have been	consistent with the study findings.
graded/deemed satisfactory by the examiners.	The report demonstrates insight into the strengths, weaknesses and implications of the investigation from a public health perspective and is well written and presented.
Pass subject to minor corrections: 5 areas have been graded/ deemed satisfactory but minor editing/typos may need to be corrected.	At the oral examination, the candidate demonstrated understanding of the public health issues arising from the work.
Pass subject to	As for Satisfactory, no major errors or omissions but minor errors or
amendments:	omissions on some issues. Some errors or omissions in sections of
	the report (background; planning; results and discussion) requiring

3-4 areas have	
been graded/	
deemed	
satisfactory by the	
examiners with no	
area deemed	
unsatisfactory	

only minor amendments. At the oral examination, the candidate demonstrated insight into the strengths, weaknesses and implications of the investigation.

The report is well written and presented and requires only minor corrections in order that the quality is appropriate to be lodged in the RCPI online repository.

<u>Fail:</u>

Less than 3 areas are graded/deemed satisfactory and/or any area graded/deemed unsatisfactory The PHR and oral examination did not meet some of the standards required to Pass or Pass with amendments. The PHR provides insufficient information about the context; or there are important errors or omissions in the examination, and description of the evidence base.

The aim and objectives are unclear, or the methods are inappropriate to achieve the stated aim and objectives; or there are important omissions or errors in the description of the study methods.

The analysis and presentation of results are technically inadequate; or there are important errors or omissions in the description, interpretation, discussion, and extraction of the results and conclusions.

The report did not demonstrate insight into the strengths, weaknesses and implications of the investigation from a public health perspective.

The report is poorly written and presented, and requires substantial corrections and amendments.

At the oral examination, the candidate did not demonstrate sound understanding of the public health issues arising from the work presented.



	2. Standard Descriptors for Grade Points
Satisfactory	Good coverage of relevant issues together with technically adequate (or where inadequate, acknowledges and explains limitations) and appropriate interpretation and no major errors or omissions.
Marginal	As for Satisfactory, a limited number of minor errors or omissions, but no major errors or omission. Minor omissions in coverage of relevant issues or technically adequate but with some minor errors, or insufficient acknowledgement or explanation of inadequacies or some minor errors or omissions in the interpretation of data.
Unsatisfactory	Insufficient information, coverage too narrow or depth inadequate, important technical inadequacies with insufficient acknowledgement or explanation of data. Interpretation is insufficiently critical and there are important errors or omissions, or substantial number of minor errors or omissions.