

Submit here: Assessment 3: Written report instructions and submission link

PHE5PUH: Principles of Public Health

Assessment 3: Written report

Assignment type	Written report: public health issue scoping paper
Weighting	40%
Word count / length	2000 words
SILOs	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Due date	Wednesday of Week 7, 11:59 pm (Melbourne time*)
*For current Melbourne time, please check information under the Assessment tile in the LMS of this subject	

Topic overview

This assessment requires you to prepare a public health scoping paper on an emerging public health issue. Scoping papers are frequently prepared by public health professionals to assist in decision making for funding and intervention choices.

Assessment criteria

This assessment will measure your ability to:

- Develop an effective executive summary (10%)
- Introduce your topic (10%)
- Demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, using relevant evidence to support your analysis (50%)
- Make recommendations and draw conclusions (20%)
- Use appropriate referencing (10%)

Guidelines

You are working as a Public Health Officer for a public health organisation and your Manager has asked you to prepare a public health scoping paper on an emerging public health issue (select one issue from the list on p. 2). Your paper will form the basis for the development of future public health interventions to change and improve the health and wellbeing of the population. Given this, your paper must present a clear, concise and accurate picture of the emerging public health problem based on the available evidence.

Your task is to use evidence to:

- Identify the significance of the issue.
- Analyse the underlying determinants, inequalities and inequities that are relevant to the issue.
- Identify and appraise evidence-based public health approaches to address the identified underlying determinants, inequalities and inequities. Ensure a mix of interventions are included in this appraisal.
- Identify and discuss the contextual factors that may influence, enable or hinder public health interventions to address the issue. Consider the political, social and cultural context, stakeholder priorities, governance, advocacy, capacity and information.
- Recommend the next steps for your organisation.

Select from one of the following issues:

- Environmental sustainability
- Population ageing
- Workplace health
- Non-communicable diseases

Once you have selected your topic from the list, you will need to narrow down the focus; within your topic select a specific issue. The topics provided are a guide for you to select an issue from within these broad areas. You also need to select a country or area to focus on this. For example, if you select Australia, you may wish to narrow this down to Victoria or regional Victoria. Note: you may choose to focus on any country/area drawing on evidence from around the world (e.g. you may select India as your country and draw on evidence from India, Australia, Europe). Please make sure you clearly specify the country/area on which you are focusing. When reporting evidence from an area or country that is not your focus, you must make this clear. For example, if you are focusing on India and you present evidence from Australia you would need to ensure that you state where the evidence is from and whether or not it is relevant to your area/country.

Scoping papers identify all aspects of a public health problem to help decision makers set priorities and consider intervention options. A key skill for any public health professional is the ability to unpack emerging public health issues and fully scope the problem before considering the solutions.

Your scoping paper aims to make the needs of the population central, ensuring the evidence public health approaches are based on appraised and contextual factors that may impact on the delivery of public health interventions are considered. A successful scoping report helps to ensure the issue is well understood with defined parameters and is the first step in ensuring the most appropriate interventions can be explored.

In preparing your report consider the following bulleted list, which serves as a guide to help you think about what to include to ensure a clear, coherent and evidence-based report.

- **Title page.** Provide a short heading (title) that describes the focus of the scoping paper, your name and your student number.
- **Executive summary.** The executive summary should not include any information that is not contained in the report. It is suggested that you write this section last. It is a high-level summary for those in your organisation who may not have the time to read the full report but are still required to make decisions about future actions. Think about the main messages you want to communicate across to senior-level people. If you only had the length of an elevator ride to present your report, what would you say? **In-text references are not required for this section.**
- **Table of contents.** Provide a list of each section in the report including the page number on which the section starts.
- **Introduction.** The purpose of this section is to set up the context of the issue for the reader including the significance of the issue and why it is important. Provide a brief summary of the issue including:
 - What the public health issue is
 - The area/country that is the focus of your scoping paper
 - The significance of the public health issue in the area you are focusing on (e.g. the **extent of the issue** and the **population groups most impacted**)
 - A statement that sets out what the rest of the scoping paper includes
- **Body of the report.** Give this section a relevant heading. You can also include sub-headings. The purpose of the body of the scoping paper is to provide the reader with a synthesis of the available evidence about the public health issue in the area you have selected. It should include the following:
 - The determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue
 - An appraisal of evidence-based public health approaches that have the potential to address the identified underlying determinants, inequalities and inequities
 - Contextual factors that may influence or hinder public health interventions to address the issue (such as the political, cultural and social contexts and stakeholder priorities)
- **Conclusions and recommendations.** Conclusions summarise what you can conclude from the evidence presented. It is not a summary of what you have already presented. What is the take-home message?
 - Your conclusion should include 2–3 sentences that summarise the 'nub' (crux or central point) of the issue or the aspect of the issue where a future public health intervention might be most useful (based on the evidence presented in the body of the scoping paper).
 - Based on the evidence presented in the body of the scoping paper, what do you recommend to your Manager as the next steps in the process of understanding the public health issue? For example, would you recommend any of the following steps to your Manager?
 - Collect information from stakeholders and the community about their views on the issue and how it impacts the community
 - Identify the points of intervention that are most strategic or likely to have the most impact
 - Identify any 'low-hanging fruit' or areas that can be intervened reasonably easily or quickly
 - Do not introduce any new information or evidence in the conclusions and recommendations section.

The evidence you use in your scoping paper should draw on a diversity of types and sources including:

- Research evidence (e.g. peer-reviewed journal articles and sources of population data and registries)
- Organisational evidence (e.g. relevant organisational reports, grey literature)

Note, the above is a guide to assist you think about where to find evidence rather than a list of all of the evidence you must include. At minimum, you must include research evidence. You are expected to include in-text citations for all information provided in the scopir paper.

Submission format

In keeping with La Trobe University policy, all assignments are to be submitted in the LMS via Turnitin.

To be accepted, your assignment submission **MUST** generate a similarity score (you are responsible for checking this). Submitting in Word or PDF format is the best way to do this. If your submission does not generate a similarity score, it cannot be checked for plagiarism and therefore **will not be marked**.

Referencing guidelines

Please use APA 7th edition as your referencing style. For more information, see the [Academic Referencing Tool of the Library](#).

Academic integrity and plagiarism

Academic integrity means being honest in academic work and taking responsibility for learning the conventions of scholarship. Academic integrity education is integral to the learning experience at La Trobe University. The University requires its academic staff and students to observe the highest ethical standards in all aspects of academic work, and it demonstrates its commitment to these values by awarding due credit for honestly conducted scholarly work, and by penalising academic misconduct and all forms of cheating.

The penalty for submitting an assignment as your own that is the work of a third-party may be severe, even leading to exclusion from the University without readmission. Refer to the [Academic Integrity — Penalties for Academic Misconduct](#) page for further information.

You should understand and be able to practice integrity in all your academic work, and be familiar with the [Academic Integrity](#) website and complete the Academic Integrity Module (LTU0AIM) found in your LMS. You only need to do this once as part of the course. This will ensure you have a good understanding of the requirements to complete any assessment and how to acknowledge other people's work through citation. Unless you have completed this module you will not be able to obtain final grades or have a course completion certificate provided by La Trobe University.

If you have any specific questions regarding Academic Integrity about your assessment, your Subject or Course Coordinator will be able to assist.

Assessment criteria / grading rubric

CRITERIA	A: Excellent (>80%)	B: Very good (70–79%)	C: Good (60–69%)	D: Acceptable (50–59%)	N: Unac (<50%)
----------	------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	-------------------

Executive summary (10 marks)

Excellent summary of the contents of the report including: the issue, the significance of the issue, the inequalities/inequities and determinants of the issue, the main points from the appraisal of a mix of public health intervention and contextual factors that may hinder or influence public health.

Executive summary contains no new information.

Excellent summary of recommended next steps.

No errors or omissions.

(8–10 marks)

Very good summary of the contents of the report including: the issue, the significance of the issue, the inequalities/inequities and determinants of the issue, the main points from the appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may hinder or influence public health.

Executive summary contains no new information.

Very good summary of recommended next steps.

Minor errors or omissions.

(7 marks)

Good summary of the contents of the report including: the issue, the significance of the issue, the inequalities/inequities and determinants of the issue, the main points from the appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may hinder or influence public health.

Executive summary contains minor pieces of new information.

Good summary of recommended next steps.

Frequent errors or omissions.

(6 marks)

Adequate summary of the contents of the report including: the issue, the significance of the issue, the inequalities/inequities and determinants of the issue, the main points from the appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may hinder or influence public health.

Executive summary contains some pieces of new information.

Adequate summary of recommended next steps.

Numerous errors or omissions.

(5 marks)

Poor or inadequate summary of the contents of the report including: the issue, the significance of the issue, the inequalities/inequities and determinants of the issue, the main points from the appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may hinder or influence public health.

Executive summary contains no new information.

Poor or inadequate summary of recommended next steps.

Numerous errors or omissions.

(<5 marks)

Introduction (10 marks)

Excellent explanation of what the issue is, the significance of the issue and a clear statement of the focus of the paper.

Excellent use of evidence (references) to support.

No errors or omissions.

(8–10 marks)

Very good explanation of what the issue is, the significance of the issue and a clear statement of the focus of the paper.

Very good use of evidence (references) to support.

Minor errors or omissions.

(7 marks)

Good explanation of what the issue is, the significance of the issue and a clear statement of the focus of the paper.

Good use of evidence (references) to support.

Frequent errors or omissions.

(6 marks)

Adequate explanation of what the issue is, the significance of the issue and a clear statement of the focus of the paper.

Adequate use of evidence (references) to support.

Numerous errors or omissions.

(5 marks)

Poor or inadequate explanation of what the issue is, the significance of the issue and a clear statement of the focus of the paper.

Poor or inadequate use of evidence (references) to support.

Numerous errors or omissions.

(<5 marks)

Body (50 marks)	Includes an excellent range of relevant evidence from diverse sources to demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, an appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may influence or hinder public health interventions to address the issue.	Includes a very good range of relevant evidence from diverse sources to demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, an appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may influence or hinder public health interventions to address the issue.	Includes a good range of relevant evidence from diverse sources to demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, an appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may influence or hinder public health interventions to address the issue.	Includes an adequate range of relevant evidence to demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, an appraisal of a mix of public health interventions and contextual factors that may influence or hinder public health interventions to address the issue.	Poor or no range of evidence from diverse sources to demonstrate the determinants of health, inequalities and inequities of the public health issue, an appraisal of public health interventions to address the issue.
	Excellent use of evidence (references) to support.	Very good use of evidence (references) to support.	Good use of evidence (references) to support.	Adequate use of evidence (references) to support.	Poor or no use of evidence (references) to support.
Recommendation and conclusions (20 marks)	No errors or omissions.	Minor errors or omissions.	Frequent errors or omissions.	Numerous errors or omissions.	Numerous errors or omissions.
	(40–50 marks)	(35–39 marks)	(30–34 marks)	(25–29 marks)	(<25 marks)
	Includes an excellent summary of conclusions, drawing on the evidence presented.	Includes a very good summary of conclusions, drawing on the evidence presented.	Includes a good summary of conclusions drawing on the evidence presented.	Includes an adequate summary of conclusions minimally drawing on the evidence presented.	Poor or no summary of conclusions not drawing on the evidence presented.
	No errors or omissions.	Minor errors or omissions.	Frequent errors or omissions.	Numerous errors or omissions.	Poor or no summary of recommendations relevant evidence presented.
	Proposes clear, realistic and evidence-based recommendations, relevant to the evidence presented.	Proposes very good, evidence-based recommendations, relevant to the evidence presented.	Proposes good evidence-based recommendations, relevant to the evidence presented.	Proposes acceptable recommendations, somewhat relevant to the evidence presented.	Numerous errors or omissions.
	No errors or omissions.	Minor errors or omissions.	Frequent errors or omissions.	Numerous errors or omissions.	Numerous errors or omissions.
Quality of report and referencing (10 marks)	(16–20 marks)	(14–15 marks)	(12–13 marks)	(10–11 marks)	(<10 marks)
	Report is well structured and written with excellent spelling and grammar.	Report is well structured and written with very good spelling and grammar.	Report is written with good spelling and grammar.	Report has some spelling and grammar errors.	Report is poorly written with many errors; no use of literature.
	Makes effective use of the relevant literature, citing all references correctly in APA7 style.	Makes good use of the relevant literature, citing references correctly in APA7 style.	Includes references to some literature, citing most references correctly in APA7 style.	Refers to some literature, but with little adherence to APA7 referencing style.	Poor adherence to APA7 referencing style.
	(8–10 marks)	(7 marks)	(6 marks)	(5 marks)	(<5 marks)

Submission status

Submission status	No attempt
Grading status	Not marked
Due date	Wednesday, 12 April 2023, 11:59 PM
Time remaining	16 days 10 hours
Last modified	-
Submission comments	▶ Comments (0)

Add submission

You have not made a submission yet.

