

# Advanced Specialised Training (AST) Project

## Assessment Rubric

This rubric outlines how AST projects are assessed to ensure transparency and clarity for registrars. It describes expectations across all marking domains and the standards required to achieve each performance level.

It is designed to support registrars in understanding expectations and successfully completing their AST project to the required professional standard.

## Overall Grading Outcomes

Level	Descriptor
<b>Pass</b>	Meets the required standard across all core domains
<b>Fail</b>	Does not meet minimum standards; substantial revision required

## Performance Levels

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Work demonstrates a high level of academic rigour, clinical relevance, and clarity; comparable to Masters/publishable standard
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meets expected standard with minor gaps; appropriate for successful completion
<b>Borderline</b>	Inconsistent or incomplete; important elements missing or underdeveloped
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Does not meet required standard; major omissions or flaws

## Marking Criteria and Expectations

### 1. Relevance to Rural Generalist Practice

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Strong and explicit relevance to rural/remote health or community needs with clear impact
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Relevant to rural generalist medicine with reasonable justification
<b>Borderline</b>	Limited or unclear relevance
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Not relevant to rural generalist context

### 2. Alignment with AST Curriculum

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Clearly aligned with AST discipline and competencies
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Generally aligned with minor gaps
<b>Borderline</b>	Partial or unclear alignment
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Does not align with AST curriculum

### 3. Ethics and Approvals

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	All required ethical and governance approvals obtained and clearly documented
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Approvals addressed with minor clarification required
<b>Borderline</b>	Evidence incomplete or unclear
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Required approvals not obtained

#### 4. Research Question / Project Aim

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Clear, focused, and well-justified aim or research question
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Clearly stated but may lack depth or precision
<b>Borderline</b>	Vague or inconsistently defined
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Absent or unclear

#### 5. Literature Review and Evidence Base

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Comprehensive, critical synthesis of relevant literature with appropriate referencing
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Adequate review with appropriate references
<b>Borderline</b>	Limited scope or weak integration of evidence
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Minimal or inappropriate literature use

#### 6. Methodology (if applicable)

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Rigorous, clearly described methods with appropriate design, sampling, and analysis
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Methods appropriate but may lack some detail
<b>Borderline</b>	Methodological weaknesses or insufficient detail
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Methods inappropriate, missing, or flawed

#### 7. Presentation and Structure

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Clear, logical, and professional presentation; easy to follow
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Generally well organised with minor issues
<b>Borderline</b>	Poor structure or lack of clarity in parts
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Disorganised and difficult to follow

### 8. Depth, Focus, and Scope (4000–5000 words or equivalent)

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Comprehensive, focused, and appropriately scoped
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Adequate depth with some minor gaps
<b>Borderline</b>	Either too superficial or unfocused
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Insufficient depth or inappropriate scope

### 9. Results / Output (if applicable)

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Results are clearly presented, well interpreted, and clinically meaningful
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Results presented with reasonable interpretation
<b>Borderline</b>	Limited clarity or interpretation
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Results absent, unclear, or incorrect

### 10. Discussion and Conclusions

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Conclusions clearly supported by findings and linked to literature; includes limitations and future directions
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Conclusions generally supported by results
<b>Borderline</b>	Weak linkage between results and conclusions
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Conclusions unsupported or absent

### 11. Overall Academic and Professional Standard

Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent</b>	Comparable to Masters-level work or publishable quality
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Appropriate for AST completion
<b>Borderline</b>	Below expected standard but salvageable
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Well below expected level

## Guidance on Project Components

Registrars should ensure their project includes the following elements where applicable:

### Background

- Clear definition of the problem
- Context within existing knowledge and practice
- Justification of significance
- Scope of the project

### Literature Review

- Defined research question guiding the review
- Transparent search strategy
- Critical synthesis of evidence
- Identification of gaps in knowledge

### Methods

- Description of participants/sample
- Data collection tools and procedures
- Analytical approach and rigour

### Results

Clear and structured presentation

Interpretation of findings (clinical and/or statistical)

### Discussion and Conclusion

- Integration with existing literature
- Statement of new knowledge or contribution
- Limitations acknowledged
- Recommendations for practice or further research

## Resubmission Requirements

Where a project is graded a Fail, registrars will receive:

- Specific feedback on areas requiring improvement
- Clear actions required prior to resubmission

## Notes

- Not all criteria apply equally to every project type (e.g. research vs resource development), but all domains should be addressed where relevant.
- Assessors consider both academic quality and practical relevance to rural and remote healthcare.