Justification of disease and target audience

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exceptionally well explained** | **Well explained** | **Partially explained** | **Poorly explained** | **No justification provided** |
| **Justification of disease** | | | | |
| The relevance of the disease is explained with utmost logic and clarity and supported by concrete evidence. Evidence is derived from reputable websites (e.g., Cancer Council Australia; Better Health Channel) and peer reviewed original research articles.  The disease should be relatively common. Evidence to support explanation includes some of the following: disease incidence and severity of impact on the individual; impact on health-care system; impact on family members and society; details on preventative measures if relevant. | Minor errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria. | Some errors compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation may be somewhat lacking in logic and clarity, and/or some evidence provided may be questionable. | Many errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation is lacking in logic and/or clarity, and/or reputable evidence is severely lacking. | Justification is missing or nonsensical. |
| **Justification of target audience** | | | | |
| The rationale for the audience selected is presented in a highly logical manner with utmost clarity.  Relevance of disease to intended audience is very clear and supported by concrete evidence. Evidence is derived from reputable websites (e.g., Cancer Council Australia; Better Health Channel) and peer reviewed original research articles.  The explanation provides an argument as to why the audience will benefit from understanding more about the disease. This may include information such as potential improved health outcomes, reduction in severity of symptoms, better management of symptoms, reduced disease spread or incidence. | Minor errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria. | Some errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation may be somewhat lacking in logic and clarity, and/or some evidence provided may be questionable. | Many errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation is lacking in logic and/or clarity, and/or reputable evidence is severely lacking. | Justification is missing or nonsensical. |

Pathophysiology explanation for lay audience

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent** | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** |
| In the communiqué, all details of the pathophysiology of the disease are explained at a level appropriate for the target audience.  To achieve this, students need to include all the key scientific concepts, with the language appropriately translated (perhaps with the use of analogies if appropriate), to make the science accessible and understandable to the target audience.  Explanation is highly likely to educate the target audience on the pathophysiology of the disease. | Minor errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation is likely to educate the target audience on the pathophysiology of the disease. | Some errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation is somewhat lacking in detail (does not cover all the key scientific concepts) and/or the explanation is pitched a little high (language a little too complex) for the target audience.  Explanation is likely to educate the target audience on the pathophysiology of the disease, although some aspects are likely to be missed by the audience. | Many errors or omissions compared to exceptionally well explained criteria.  Explanation is lacking in detail (does not cover all the key scientific concepts) and/or the explanation is pitched too high (language too complex) for the target audience. Target audience will most likely struggle to have a good understanding of the disease. | Explanation is deemed inappropriate for the target audience. It is concluded that the explanation will not educate the target audience on the disease. |

Production quality

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent** | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** |
| **Professional quality** | | | | |
| Communiqué is of a professional standard and is error-free.  Contains very high-quality aesthetics, video/sound (if relevant), images (if relevant) | Minor errors compared to excellent criteria. | Some errors compared to excellent criteria. | Many errors compared to excellent criteria. | Communiqué is severely lacking in a professional quality and may be full of errors. |

Creativity

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent** | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** |
| Communiqué is original and highly imaginative and memorable and is key to the overall impact of the communication. | Communiqué is original and imaginative and memorable and is key to the overall impact of the communication. | Communiqué is somewhat original, imaginative and memorable. | Communiqué is lacking in imagination and is unlikely to be memorable. | Communiqué is unimaginative and is not memorable. |

Quality of communication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent** | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** |
| **Engaging** | | | | |
| The pathophysiology explanation is highly likely to be interesting and engaging for the target audience.  Highly engaging pieces will most likely be due to a combination of factors including clarity of the pathophysiology explanation, logical flow of information, language choices, visual appeal (if relevant), quality of narration (if relevant), professional level production. | Minor errors compared to excellent criteria. | Some errors compared to excellent criteria. | Many errors compared to excellent criteria. | The pathophysiology explanation is likely to be of little interest, and unengaging. |
| **Flow** | | | | |
| The communication flowed exceptionally well as it had a highly logical structure. | Minor errors compared to excellent criteria. | Some errors compared to excellent criteria.  Some sections could have a better logical structure. | Many errors compared to excellent criteria.  Communication is lacking a logical structure. | Communication is severely lacking a logical structure. |
| **Language** | | | | |
| Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation.  Language in communiqué is highly appropriate to audience. | Minor errors compared to excellent criteria | Some errors compared to excellent criteria. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the communication.  Language in communiqué may not be appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the communiqué.  Language in presentation may not be appropriate to audience. |