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1. Background
The RACMA Fellowship Training Program (FTP) is delivered as four domains of continuous learning in formative workplace activities and summative assessment tasks that have been named:

- Health System Science (HSS);
- Medical Management Practice (MMP);
- Research Training (RT); and
- Personal and Professional Leadership Development (PPLD).

Candidates must perform satisfactorily in each Domain, within specified time periods, in order to be eligible for membership of the College in the category of Fellow.

Research Training Domain (RTD) activities were introduced into the FTP in 2012 in accordance with the College’s progress towards meeting the standards of the Australian Medical Council for Specialist Medical Colleges. The principles and structure were reviewed in 2018, and some of the activities have been modified.

The following information relates to all Candidates beginning candidacy in 2019. Those Candidates who are already in training and well on their way to completion of the expected domain activities should continue with this pathway.

Those who have not yet begun their RTD projects may wish to transfer to working on one of the new options. Candidates who wish to make changes to their programs should apply to the College Office for acknowledgment of the anticipated changes and endorsement of their new plans.

2. Research Training Policy
The RTD for the role competency (graduate outcome) of Scholar-Researcher has intended learning outcomes, formative learning expectations and summative assessment methods.

The principles of the RACMA RTD are:

- that Candidates demonstrate participation in learning about evidence-informed decision-making for health service management and medical administration;
- that human research ethics implementation issues are considered in the conduct of health service investigatory projects;
- that a data-driven project in medical administration (i.e. health system management and/or clinician leadership) is completed; and
- that investigatory projects are assessed as achieving a satisfactory level of competence.
The components of the Domain are expected to be completed within a minimum of three and maximum of six calendar years from the commencement of candidacy. Exemptions from components may be made, and credit may be granted for previous activities or qualifications.

Planning the project needs to take account of availability of project supervisor, opportunities for the candidate to access data, response-time commitments of participants and potential for movement of the Candidate to sites or roles that may improve or in fact, preclude, project completion.

The College provides opportunities for Oral Presentations of Research project progress to be summatively assessed, usually at, or around, training workshops, to optimise the availability of assessors. Candidates are advised to check the College website and take note of Candidate bulletins on the e-Learning portal for deadlines for submission of proposals and applications for opportunities for summative assessments.

3. Learning outcomes
In keeping with the Curriculum¹, the overall aim of the RACMA RTD is to raise Candidate awareness of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to critically evaluate information for decision making in health service management.

The learning outcomes of the RTD are that Candidates will be able to:

• Identify a data-driven health services project question relevant to the practice of medical administration;

• Choose an appropriate method for deriving knowledge from study of a health service management question;

• Acknowledge relevant human research ethics issues and Human Research Ethics Committee processes associated with dealing with a service-related question;

• Undertake a collation of relevant and current information about a health service management issue;

• Analyse, interpret and discuss evidence adduced from a systematic study; and

• Draw conclusions and make recommendations relating to outcomes identified from the project.

4. Timetable for Research Training Domain activities

¹ RACMA (2011): Medical Leadership and Management Curriculum Document
The standard timetable for a Candidate with no recognition of previous learning is:

- **Year 1**
  Participation in a Master’s level course in health services research; Participation in research domain webinars; and Development of a proposal for an evidence-informed project by the end of Year 1 (or the beginning of Year 2).

- **Years 2/3**
  Continuation of participation in webinars if needed; Written submission of a proposal for an evidence-informed project by beginning Year 2, for endorsement as suitable for summative assessment; Conduct of an evidence-informed project; and Oral presentation of progress in, or completion of, a project at the beginning of Year 3.

- **Years 3/4**
  Completion of a project; and Written report for assessment by end Year 3/beginning Year 4.

5. **Formal learning about evidence-informed decision-making**
Candidates are expected to complete formal study at Master level in *Research Methods*, or *Epidemiology and Statistics* or *Evidence-informed decision-making*. This may be undertaken as a course in a concurrent Master’s degree, or credit may be granted for previous learning. It is expected that Candidates undertake this course as early as possible in their candidacies in order to maximise their preparation, and the time available for their projects.

6. **College Research Webinars**
To enhance the learning experience of Candidates and interested Supervisors, the College RTD Committee schedules monthly webinars.

The format for the webinars will be that of presentation on the topic for the month, followed by questions and discussion. There will also be time for Candidates to raise issues with their projects that may be useful to share with their colleagues.

Webinars will be held once per month on **FRIDAYS, 12.30pm to 1.30pm (Melbourne time)**. Dates will be made available on the website and in the e-Learning Portal. It is expected that recordings of the webinars will be available via the RACMA e-Learning portal.

The schedule for the RTD Webinar Program for 2019 appears below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Webinar Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 February</td>
<td>Overview of Research Training Domain, Types of Project Proposal, Oral Presentation, Written Work and Webinar Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>Research Project - Overview of Acceptable Research Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Quality Improvement (QI) Project- Overview Of Acceptable QI Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>Literature Reviews and Other Projects – What are the Minimum Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>Data Management and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>Ethical Issues in Projects and Dealing with Ethics Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 September</td>
<td>System Dynamics Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October</td>
<td>Feedback on Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November</td>
<td>To Be Advised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Options for the RTD Project

Candidates have several options for development of their RTD projects:

- a curiosity-driven health services research project;
- a substantial investigation for a quality improvement management task, using a scholarly approach;
- a systematic analysis of literature, utilising a standardised protocol, relevant to a health service/medical management task; or
- a bio-ethical disputation of an issue arising in the training workplace.
7.1 Health services research
A research project is a systematic investigation aiming to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

The College has adopted the definition of health services research as articulated by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Committee in 2011:

*Health services research is research into how financing arrangements, health technologies and social factors affect the quality, cost, availability and access to health care.*

Candidates undertaking concurrent study in research methods or epidemiology may find that they are guided in their research question by their participation in their courses. Others may have joined a medical services unit with a substantial health service research program, and it may be appropriate for them to make a substantial commitment to a component of an existing research program.

The research project may be quantitative or qualitative – the key issue for the novice researcher is the availability of supervision - in the workplace or university departments.

7.2 Quality Improvement investigation
A Quality Improvement project is a systematic, data-guided activity designed to elicit immediate improvements in health care delivery, in a particular setting. Any activity in which the primary purpose is the monitoring, or the improvement in the quality, of service delivered by an individual or an organisation, is a quality improvement activity.

The intent of quality improvement activities is to suggest potentially effective models, strategies or assessment tools, or to provide benchmarks, rather than to contribute to generalizable knowledge².

Surveillance and auditing of process conformance to expected norms may be a substantial undertaking in some health system situations; as may, for example, the data analysis required for service planning. Some Candidates may prefer to link into a workplace quality improvement process if there is likely to be substantial information gathering and analysis involved.

7.3 Systematic literature review
A systematic literature review may be a substantial project in itself. It rigorously assists in determining what is already known about a proposed question, appraises the quality of the research evidence and synthesises the evidence from the studies of the highest quality.

---

A clearly defined question is required for a systematic literature review in terms of Participants, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes and Study design (PICOS) and the Candidate will be expected to outline the project according to a systematic review protocol such as those of the Cochrane Library or the Campbell Collaboration.

### 7.4 Bioethical disputation

Bioethics is commonly understood to refer to the ethical implications and applications of the health-related life sciences. For practitioners in medical administration and medical leadership, there is sometimes a need for a scholarly approach to planning or implementing new technologies, procedures or services. Topics such as neonatal intensive care procedures, organ transplantation, pelvis exenteration surgery, radiation therapy, fertility treatments and some clinical trials, raise many questions in the minds of medical administrators.

A bioethical disputation is essentially a well-referenced philosophical essay. It may be appropriately required for the justification of actions for strategic planning, board reporting or grant applications. Candidates may be working in a situation which prompts the need for such an investigation. They may choose to consider developing a systematic review of two sides of an ethics question - defense of the topic as well as rebuttal; and then drawing together the findings into a justifiable conclusion.

### 8. Development of a proposal

Candidates are encouraged to commence work in the Research Training Domain (RTD) early in their Fellowship Training Program to ensure adequate time to complete their projects prior to seeking election to Fellowship. The core Masters units: *Epidemiology and Statistics, or Research Methodology (or equivalent) or Evidence-informed decision-making* provide important frameworks for the Research Training Domain. Some may require active participation in proposal development and/or literature review and they may subsequently guide development of the RACMA-assessable project.

The Webinar schedule is intended to enhance learning in these areas and assist Candidates to choose their investigations appropriately.

Candidates will develop a suitable health service investigatory project and submit a written proposal of approximately 1,000 words, for endorsement by the College, by the end of their first year of candidacy or beginning of the second year.

The proposal should take the general form of a submission to a supervisor for approval to conduct a project, or a proposal for a grant application. Feedback will be provided to the Candidate and it will be endorsed for its appropriateness for the basis of summative assessments for the RTD. Any changes to the project following endorsement will need to be notified to the College.

The proposal will outline:

- The background to the project or preliminary literature review;
- The research/investigation question or hypothesis;
- The methodology proposed to ‘answer’ the question;
- The human research ethics issues to be considered;
- The anticipated data analysis techniques to be employed; and
• The potential timetable for the activity.

The proposal should be submitted via the e-portal utilising the universal cover sheet during the web-advertised period for assessment. (Appendix 1 Cover sheet, Appendix 2 Proposal and endorsement form, Appendix 3 Detailed proposal feedback)

9. Consideration of human research ethics issues

It is expected that the Candidate’s project will be considered for its human research ethics implications. It may be necessary for an ethics application to be made.


Institutions may choose to exempt from ethical review research that: (a) is negligible risk research; and (b) involves the use of existing collections of data or records that contain only non-identifiable data about human beings. They will have in place processes that ensure that in deciding to exempt research from an ethical review, they are determining that the research meets the requirements of the National Statement and is ethically acceptable.

Candidates working in Australia should refer to the Australia online forms research site, https://au.ethicsform.org/SignIn.aspx to determine the relevant requirements.

In New Zealand, the Health Research Council of New Zealand has similar legislation which requires submission of relevant forms for assessment of ethical issues relating to human research and investigation.


Candidates must provide evidence that their proposals meet the relevant site or jurisdictional HREC’s eligibility for consideration as low or negligible risk (LNR) inquiry, or that the relevant HREC has provided approval, prior to conducting their projects. (Section in Appendix 2)

10. Conduct of the project

Candidates are expected to be conducting their RTD projects in their second and third years of candidacy, with appropriate support from relevant supervisors as agreed in discussions in Annual Training Planning sessions.

11. Oral presentation of RTD Progress
The Oral Presentation of RTD Progress is intended to assess Candidates’ abilities in communication as well as their development of evidence-informed management reasoning. It is intended to simulate a presentation to an Executive meeting or a Scientific Meeting, outlining the project and presenting interim or final results.

The presentation will be about the project that has been endorsed by the College for summative assessment, and the projects should have been commenced for the Candidates to be eligible to present.

The Oral Presentation of RTD progress is a summative assessment requirement. It is undertaken by RTD Assessors, who are also members of the Board of Censors. Applications open approximately 2 months before the scheduled date, and abstracts for the presentation are expected one month prior to the date. (Appendix 4 Abstract submission)

Presentations are made in sessions of approximately two hours, with Censors and the other Candidates booked for the session, making up the audience. Each Candidate has 20 minutes: 15 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for questions from the assessing Censors and/or the members of the audience. Abstracts will have been provided to each session. Candidates may wish to bring updated abstracts and/or handouts to their presentations.

The presentation outlines the Candidate’s progress or describes the completed project, as might be prepared for a Board meeting, or a small group presentation at a Scientific Meeting.

12. Assessment of Oral Presentation
An Oral Presentation should demonstrate that the Candidate has gained significant knowledge and developed practical skills in the preparation, governance and conduct of research or evidence-informed investigation; and that they can present and discuss its implications for health care delivery.

The standardised assessment rubric can be found in Appendix 5 - Assessment Rubric: Oral Presentations of RTD Project. Note that presentation content is worth 50% of the mark and presentation skills are worth 50%.

An Oral Presentation is both an outline of fact in terms of project progress and a discussion of Candidate learnings concerning evidence-informed decision-making.
The rubric allocates 50% of the marks for content. The presentation should include the following points:

- The context and reason for selection of the research question or investigation;
- Links to current literature on the topic and relevant theories (if applicable);
- How this study will contribute to knowledge in medical administration;
- The rationale for the study method and the chosen analysis, including how this will be, or was, achieved in the time available;
- Preliminary, or final, findings;
- Conclusions if available and implications for service provision;
- The issues and challenges identified and how these are, will be, or were, overcome.

The marks for communication skill are allocated for comprehensive and clear communication:

- The abstract is a concise description of the content of the presentation;
- The presentation relates to the abstract;
- There is a logical flow of topics: Introduction, Aims/Objectives, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Implications, Challenges, Recommendations/Reflections;
- There is a limited number of slides (10-15 for a 15-minute presentation), without spelling mistakes, using appropriate formatting;
- Slides and videos are used purposefully as prompts, not as scripts for reading to the audience;
- Tables and charts are also purposeful – the information, comparisons or trends are easy to identify;
- The audience is engaged with eye contact;
- Questions are answered knowledgably.

Note. Candidates wishing to present for the exit Oral Examinations in 2019 will be required to have satisfactorily completed an Oral Presentation of Research Progress prior to sitting the examination. For Oral Examinations from 2020, this will not be a pre-requisite.

Candidates performing their Oral Presentations of Research Progress in February 2019 to meet the eligibility requirement for the 2019 Oral Examinations will be assessed according to the 2018 rubric - 30% communication and 70% for content – as outlined in Appendices 5.2.1 and 5.2.2).
13. Written report of RTD Project

The written report of the completed project is also a summative assessment activity. It demonstrates a Candidate’s scholarly ability to plan and conduct relevant data collection using an appropriate method, to analyse evidence, to draw conclusions and to present written findings to a relevant audience.

It is expected to be approximately **3,000 words in length** and must include a **500 -1,000-word professional reflection** on learning about health services research. The final report may vary, depending on the choice of project options. Generally, it will be expected that a research project report which is ‘publication-ready’ will stand alone and the reflection will be separately provided. For a quality improvement project report it may be appropriate that reflection on professional management processing can be incorporated into the conclusions or recommendations.

The written report should be **submitted within a maximum of twelve months of completion of the project**, to ensure currency of its findings (as would be expected for publication-ready research, reporting to a Board or inclusion in a business case) and to allow for assessment within the timeframe for the Candidate’s pathway. The written report is expected to be considered satisfactory within a maximum of six calendar years of commencement of candidacy for the Candidate to be eligible for Fellowship.

13.1 Literature review

The written report should have an adequate literature review either at the beginning to set the background for the study or in the discussion as justification for the conclusions being made.

‘A literature review gives an overview of the field of inquiry: what has already been said on the topic, who the key writers are, what the prevailing theories and hypotheses are, what questions are being asked, and what methodologies and methods are appropriate and useful.’[^3] A literature review critically appraises the publications (both academic and ‘grey’ literature) relevant to the research investigation, both theoretical (ideas-based) or empirical (collected or observed data). The main purpose is to locate the research within the context of what is already known in the topic area, and how the investigation could contribute more knowledge to the field.

Health Services Research (HSR) is not a single-discipline research. It seeks to understand dimensions of health services from multiple perspectives. In developing a research question, trainees are expected to draw on theoretical frameworks from a variety of disciplines including medicine, nursing, allied health, psychology, sociology, political science and history, management science and health economics. It is therefore important to read widely when informing the topic area.

‘Literature’ can comprise books, journals, newspapers, government publications and reports, and published and unpublished theses. A handy tip is to look closely at the references in a relevant study – they may lead to useful other sources and save time in searching.

Some topics require considerable literature review in order to justify research or service questions. The review should be written as an analysis of the literature, not just a list of articles. Some

Candidates may choose to undertake a systematic literature review or a disputation as their projects – these will need to follow standardised protocols such as those of the Cochrane or Campbell Collaborations.

13.2 Methodology

In Health Services Research, methods may be observational, experimental or mixed. They may be quantitative or qualitative. Thought needs to be given to the methodology most likely to be useful in answering the question.

An observational method involves observation of naturally occurring events. It will not be interventional. It could be descriptive (usually comparative) or hypothesis testing. It could be retrospective or prospective.

An experimental or quasi-experimental method involves an intervention, the effects of which are the main focus of the project. An experimental method will be prospective, hypothesis testing and not descriptive. Most evaluations are of this type, where the program or process is the “intervention” of interest.

13.3 Data collection and analysis

The method adopted will determine the data available. Data take many forms – numeric and qualitative; pictorial, database-oriented and oral – and they can be collected in a variety of ways including scientific experimentation observation, and/or questionnaires and interviews.

Data analysis is the search for meaning and understanding. Interpretation of data must relate to the rationale and objectives of the study.

For Candidates engaging in quantitative research, important concepts will include:

- Significance: the likelihood that a result could have been found by chance,
- Generalisability: the likelihood that the results will have broader applicability,
- Reliability: the capacity for another researcher to duplicate the study and achieve the same results, and the
- Validity: whether the methods, approaches and techniques relate to the issues being explored.

For those engaging in qualitative research, the units of analysis tend to be words, not numbers. Terms such as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability, replace the more positivist criteria of validity, reliability and objectivity. Candidates will need to consider the scope of their studies - in terms of access, availability of time, availability of appropriate subjects, costs and human research ethics issues. Candidates may apply to the College Office for access to advice and guidance from Fellows with Research Training experience.

---

13.4 Referencing

A referencing system is used to:

- Indicate the exact source of a quotation,
- Acknowledge indebtedness for options or ideas,
- Give authority for a fact which may be open to reasonable doubt,
- Acknowledge other writers’ views which, if elaborated upon in the assignment itself, might distract the reader from the mainstream of thought.

RACMA requires a standard referencing system for the Research Training Domain Written Report. It is the Candidate’s responsibility to learn the referencing system and to use it consistently. Referencing is an assessment criterion, and Candidates are expected to ensure all citations and references – in-text and in the Bibliography – are correct. If incorrect referencing is identified, the Candidate will be requested to rectify and resubmit the report.

Candidates may wish to consider referencing management software to manage the search and literature review. These software packages, such as EndNote or Refman\(^5\) allow downloading of references from databases, documenting searches, saving and organising retrieved articles, and making changes to, and editing, references.

13.5 Plagiarism

Candidates must be vigilant in avoiding plagiarism in their studies. Any evidence of plagiarism will require Candidates to rewrite and resubmit their studies. In addition, candidacy may be considered for remediation or possibly termination. Candidates should keep track of all their sources, cite accordingly, and if in doubt, reference.

14. Assessment of Written report

The Written Report is a summative assessment task. Candidate’s Preceptors and Supervisors (or Supervisors for Research) will sign that they have been involved in advising Candidates on the written document’s readiness for submission for assessment. Candidates should discuss with them well in advance and agree to the amount of time that will be required to read the Written Report. Candidates also need to be aware that adjustments that may be required following feedback may take time.

Written reports should be submitted via the e-Learning portal. The written report is assessed by RTD assessors (experienced researchers who are members of the Board of Censors) using the standardised rubric at Appendix 6. Note that the written report has 30% of its marks allocated to formatting and 70% to content.

Candidates’ reports are assessed as ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’. Candidates are given feedback and allowed to re-submit their papers if they have been unsatisfactory. Candidates may wish to use the following checklist to address the completeness of their written reports.

14.1 Content (70%)

Title:

\(^5\) http://endnote.com/; http://www.refman.com/
Does it clearly describe the nature of the investigation?

Abstract:
Does it accurately summarise the main aims, research question, methods, results, conclusions and recommendations?

Introduction:
• Is there a clear statement of the context, problem, issue or research question?
• Is the rationale or the background for the study based on published literature or a need for research on the issue?

Aims and objectives:
• Are the aims and objectives clearly stated and do the objectives logically follow on from the overall aim?
• Do the aims and objectives clearly reflect the stated problem or issue, background and rationale?
• Is the Candidate clear about the intended outcomes of the Study?

Literature review:
• Has the Candidate carried out a literature search of adequate depth and scope?
• Does it include a review of both past and current scholarship?
• Is there a variety of sources other than journal literature?
• Does the depth of search reflect adequate time spent on research?
• Is the review relevant to the issue being studied and the aims and objectives of the Study?
• Is the text correctly and appropriately referenced?

Methods:
Is there a clear description of the:
• Conduct of the study
• Study and sample populations
• Sampling method and number
• Sample inclusion and exclusion criteria
• Survey instrument/s or intervention

Data collection:
• Source and features of the data set that was analysed
• Does the survey instrument, questionnaire or intervention (if developed by the Candidate) show original thinking?
• Is the survey instrument or intervention (if not developed by the Candidate) a published or validated one?
• Is the form of data analysis appropriate to the method?
• Has the conduct of the Case Study addressed ethical considerations and followed sound research ethics processes?
• Are there appropriate subject information statements and consent forms if relevant?
• Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
Analysis:
- Method of the analysis
- Statistical tests that were used?

Results:
- Do the results logically reflect the method used and the stated aims and objectives of the Study?

Discussion:
- Does the Candidate give an accurate interpretation of the findings and implications of the results?
- Are the results discussed in relation to the literature the Candidate has searched and reviewed?
- Does the Candidate compare their results and interpretation with other relevant studies?
- Are the results discussed in relation to the stated problem, research question, aims and objectives of the Study?
- Does the Candidate reflect on and discuss any limitations or constraints of the study?

Conclusions:
- Are the key results, interpretations/implications of the results accurately summarised?
- Do the conclusions accurately reflect the results and interpretation of the data?

Recommendations:
- Does the Candidate make recommendations in relation to future research or actions as a result of the study?
- Are the recommendations feasible and relevant to the issue that was studied?

14.2 Format (30%)
- Does the Candidate employ a consistent and high level of writing, grammar, spelling and punctuation?
- Is the citation and referencing style accurate and consistent?
- Has the Candidate avoided plagiarism and excessive quoting?
- Are all non-original tables, statistics and figures’ sources correctly acknowledged?
- Are all cited sources listed in the bibliography?
- Are all relevant questionnaires, letters and ethics approvals appended?

See Appendix 6 for the rubric for assessment of the final written report.

15 Recognition of Prior Learning or Experience
Candidates may apply for recognition of previous learning or experience in health services research or evidence-informed decision-making in health management (usually at the beginning of their candidacies).

Exemptions from components of the program may be granted for applications which demonstrate:
- Consistent and comprehensive application of a scholarly approach to decision-making in health service management or medical administration over several years;
- Formal qualifications at AQF Level 9 or above in health services research; or
• Publication/s in relevant health management journals or for health organisations’ governance situations

Investigative study/ies:
• should be at Master’s degree level (or equivalent) or above;
• should have been completed/published in the previous 5 years;
• should have the Candidate as sole/first author or a lead investigator;
• should be directly relevant to health service management or medical administration;
• should demonstrate a satisfactory knowledge of the research process:
  o formulation of robust research questions and study design;
  o conduct of literature reviews in relevant and reputable source materials;
  o sound data-gathering methodologies;
  o relevant and technically correct analysis of results;
  o arguing a convincing position based on the results;
  o drawing meaningful conclusions; and
  o outlining implications for health care.

Exemptions and credit may be granted for:
- Research Methods subject in Master’s degree studies
- Research Proposal
- HREC review
- Project conduct
- Written report of project outcomes

The Oral Presentation of progress in, or completion of, an evidence-informed decision-making/research project or case study will be mandatory for all Candidates unless full exemption from activities in the Domain have been granted.

Candidates in the Medical Executive pathway who have been granted part exemptions from work in the Domain will be required to present a management case study which highlights evidence-informed decision-making.

Candidates whose publications have been credited will be required to present on the credited study or the component of their work which is identified for summative assessment, at their Oral Presentations of Project Progress.

See Appendix 7 Application for credit in the Research Training Domain.

16 Appeals process
Should a Candidate wish to seek reconsideration or review of the Panel’s and/or Censors’ decisions, they may make such application under the College’s Policy for Reconsideration, Review and Appeal of Decisions. College Polices Policies and Regulations are available on the College website.

17 Research Training Domain Support
Candidates will have access to support and advice on their development and progress through the RTD.
17.1 Preceptors and supervisors
Preceptors and Supervisors will provide ongoing guidance and support. This includes:

- Consultation regarding Research or scholarly Quality Improvement Project, Ethics application and Report writing,
- Feedback, and
- Advice on matters of presentation and submission

If not experienced themselves, they may suggest another person at the workplace who can assist with advising Candidates on research activities. Candidates undertaking projects concurrently with Master’s study may find that their University tutors are willing to supervise and advise.

The Supervisor or Preceptor must sign the Cover sheets of RTD RTP Assessment Tasks and Written Work before submission for assessment. This endorsement states that the Preceptor has been involved in reviewing the research project.

17.2 College staff
Candidates will be able to seek advice on the development of their research questions and projects from members of the RTD Committee. Assistance and advice from the College Office staff will be provided in relation to the assessment process, submission of tasks and eligibility to sit the Oral Presentation.

17.3 College webinars
The College will schedule monthly RTD webinars to provide Candidates with a forum to discuss RTD project related issues and seek advice on the RTD project and the development of their Ethics Application Forms. These teleconferences are open to Supervisors and Preceptors and are facilitated by the Lead Fellow in Research, the Dean or their delegates. These meetings are designed to provide general guidance on research projects, presentations and the journey being taken towards becoming a scholarly medical administrator.

17.4 Research advisors
The College will identify a number of College Fellows and external experts with knowledge in certain aspects of Health Services Research. These experts will be invited to participate in workshops and webinars throughout the RTD activities. Candidates are also encouraged to discuss their Research Projects with academics during their Masters programs for additional support. Candidates may also approach colleagues or peers to assist them, for example, to discuss a research topic, to gain permission to access data, or to share sources of literature. When a Candidate receives significant assistance and this is incorporated in their Research Based Written Paper such person/s must be acknowledged by the Candidate.

18 Resources
Literature review:

Greenhalgh, T. ‘How to read a paper: papers that summarise other papers (systematic reviews and meta-analyses)’ BMJ 315: 672, 1997.


‘Literature review’, RMIT, 2013: http://www.rmit.edu.au/browse;ID=cdb4z3x5a44k


Research methodology:


‘Assessing the Credibility of Online Sources’, The Write Place and LEO, St Cloud State University (MN), 2005: http://leo.stcloudstate.edu/research/credibility1.html


Burford, B. et al (2009): Asking the right questions: 12 tips on developing and administering a questionnaire survey for healthcare professionals. Medical Teacher 31: 207-211


Health Services Research (HSR) Methods: http://www.hsrmethods.org/


Lohr, K. N. and Steinwachs, D. M. 'Health services research: an evolving definition of the field', Health Serv Res, 37:1, 7-9, 2002.


Ethics:


Writing:


Referencing:


Relevant Journals (ranked by Impact Factor)
*Medical Care Research and Review*, Impact Factor 2.959 - Research in health care services: [http://www.sagepub.com/journals/Journal200970](http://www.sagepub.com/journals/Journal200970)

*BMC Medical Research Methodology*, Impact Factor 2.67: [http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcmedresmethodol/](http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcmedresmethodol/)


*Health Care Management Review*, Impact Factor 1.23 - Research on health care management, leadership and administration: [http://journals.lww.com/hcmrjournal/Pages/default.aspx](http://journals.lww.com/hcmrjournal/Pages/default.aspx)

*BMC Health Services Research*, Impact Factor 1.72 - [http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmchealthservres](http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmchealthservres)


Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management, No impact factor:  
http://www.springer.com/business+%26+management/business+for+professionals/journal/10490

General:  


Handbook of Health Services Research: http://tinyurl.com/ab4yzs3

Health Services Research Association Australia and New Zealand (HSRAANZ):  
http://www.hsraanz.org

Institute of Medicine, Health Services Research: Workforce and Educational Issues. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1995:  
http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=5020&page=R1

National Information Center on Health Services Research and Health Care Technology:  
http://www.nlm.nih.gov/nichsr/


'Patient and Public Involvement', National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2010:  


'Service User Involvement: Best Practice Guide', Service User Involvement:  
http://www.serviceuserinvolvement.co.uk


University of New South Wales, *Project Guidelines*, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, 2010: [http://bit.ly/1278dq0](http://bit.ly/1278dq0)

APPENDICES
Appendix 1 Assessment Task Cover Sheet

ASSESSMENT TASK COVER SHEET

CANDIDATE NAME: ................................................................................................................................

CANDIDATE EMAIL: ................................................................................................................................

TRAINING COMMENCEMENT YEAR: ...................... STUDY STATUS (FT/PT): ......................

PRECEPTOR/SUPERVISOR/RTD SUPERVISOR’S NAME.................................................................

WORD COUNT.......................... (Please refer to guidelines for required number of words)

DATE SUBMITTED: ............................................................

Fellowship Training Program Written Assessment Tasks:

☐ Indigenous Health Webinar Assessment Task

☐ Research Training Domain Proposal

☐ Ethics consideration statement or Application Approval (if required)

☐ Research Training Domain Abstract for Oral Presentations

☐ Research Training Domain Report ☐ Re-submission of Research Training Domain Report

☐ Management Case Study Proposal

☐ Management Case Study Abstract for Oral Presentations

☐ Management Case Study Paper ☐ Resubmission of Management Case Study Paper

DECLARATIONS:

‘I hereby declare that the intellectual content of this submission is the product of my own work, even though I may have received assistance from others in style, presentation and linguistic expression. Where necessary, permission has been granted by my supervisor/employer to use confidential information from my workplace.’

SIGNED: ................................................................. (Candidate) DATE: .................................

‘I confirm that I have been engaged in the development of and discussions with the Candidate on this piece of work. I acknowledge that I have read this piece of work and advised on its readiness for assessment by markers.’

SIGNED: ................................................................. (Preceptor/Supervisor) DATE: .................
Appendix 2 RTD Proposal Application and Endorsement Form

1. Candidate details:
   Candidate: ____________________  Candidate Email: ____________________
   Preceptor/RTD Supervisor: ____________________

2. Research Training Domain Project option:
   Please indicate which of the following options you have undertaken for completing your RTD project:
   - Health services research
   - Quality management project
   - Systematic literature review
   - Bio-ethical disputation

3. Title of RTD project:
   __________________________________________________________
   - Attach 300-1,000-word project proposal

4. Human research ethics statement
   - Ethics application not required
   - Ethics application and approval attached

5. Feedback and Endorsement

Following a review of your RTD Project Proposal, I endorse that your proposed/completed Project is health services related and it meets RACMA requirements. It is this proposal which will be acceptable for summative assessment at the Oral Presentation and/or for your final written paper. Feedback attached (if relevant).

RTD Assessor’s Name: ____________________
RTD Assessor’s Signature: ____________________  Date: __________
### Appendix 3  Feedback on Health Services Project Proposal (if relevant)

**RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN**

**FEEDBACK ON HEALTH SERVICES PROJECT PROPOSAL**

**NOTE:** Candidates may use this form as a guide in their preparation when developing their RTD Proposals.

Candidate…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Title of Proposal:** .......................................................... **Word Count:** .........................

**Option for project:**  
- ☐ Health services research  
- ☐ Quality management project  
- ☐ Systematic literature review  
- ☐ Bio-ethical disputation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design an evidence-informed project:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
<td>In your RTD:</td>
<td>In your RTD proposal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- links to theories and literature:</td>
<td>draw on a wide selection of relevant theories and research literature to inform your project within the discipline, literature, and inform your RTD project and design</td>
<td>draw on a wide selection of relevant theories and research literature to inform your RTD topic and design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- methods of investigation and analysis:</td>
<td>justified in selecting your choice and use of your methods, methodology and analytic techniques (in terms of, e.g., relevance, rigor, reliability)</td>
<td>justified in selecting your choice and use of your methods, methodology and analytic techniques (in terms of, e.g., relevance, rigor, reliability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- scope, limitations and ethical challenges:</td>
<td>explicitly and comprehensively considered the scope, limitations and ethical challenges in conducting your project</td>
<td>identified and described most of the scope, limitations and ethical challenges in conducting your project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rearranged evidence in the field of medical administration:</td>
<td>identified potential for evidence in the discipline of Medical Administration</td>
<td>identified some potential for evidence in the discipline of Medical Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholarly communication:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
<td>In your RTD Proposal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expressed ideas that were</td>
<td>Expressed ideas that were</td>
<td>Expressed ideas that were</td>
<td>Expressed ideas that were</td>
<td>Expressed ideas that were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logically structured, logically structured, logically structured, clearly expressed throughout the work</td>
<td>clearly structured throughout the work</td>
<td>clearly structured throughout the work</td>
<td>clearly structured throughout the work</td>
<td>clearly expressed throughout the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- employed an extensive and relevant discipline specific vocabulary</td>
<td>employed an extensive and relevant discipline specific vocabulary</td>
<td>employed an extensive and relevant discipline specific vocabulary</td>
<td>employed an extensive and relevant discipline specific vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- used referencing to explore and provide additional or alternative ideas for the reader; while accurately adhering to a referencing convention</td>
<td>accurately adhered to a referencing convention</td>
<td>accurately adhered to a referencing convention</td>
<td>accurately adhered to a referencing convention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RACMA Enabling Competencies*10.7;10.8; 13.1; 13.3; 13.4; 19.1; 19.3; 19.4; 20.1; 20.4; 21.1; 21.2; 21.3; 21.4; 21.5; 21.6; 21.7

### Further Feedback to Candidate:

RTD Assessor’s Name: __________________________

RTD Assessor’s Signature: ______________________ Date: ________________
# RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN

## Oral Presentation Application & Abstract Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor/Supervisor Name</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Year</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Status (FT/PT)</td>
<td>F/T ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College endorsed RTD/Management Case study Proposal (Y/N)</td>
<td>Y ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics approval needed (Y/N)</td>
<td>Y ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Approval Letter Uploaded (Y/N) (Still select/tick “Y” if you intend to upload it within 48 hours of uploading your abstract but have not yet done so).</td>
<td>Y ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* If “N” (you are not able to provide a copy of your Ethics Approval Letter), please give your reason.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option for project:</th>
<th>☐ Health services research</th>
<th>☐ Quality management project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Systematic literature review</td>
<td>☐ Bioethical disputation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abstract**

Provide an abstract of 250 – 300 words of your Project in Progress / Completed project.
## Appendix 5.1 Assessment Rubrics for Oral Presentations (For use after April 2019)

### RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN

**ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR ORAL PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH IN PROGRESS/COMPLETED RESEARCH**  
*(50% Content, 50% Communication)*

**Candidate** ..........................................................................................................................  
**Title of Presentation:** ........................................................................................................  
**Option for project:**  
☐ Health services research  
☐ Quality management project  
☐ Systematic literature review  
☐ Bio-ethical disputation

### 5.1.1 Assessment Rubrics – project in progress or completed – 50% content, 50% communication *(After April 2019)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed an evidence-informed project relevant to Medical Administration, with background and hypothesis</td>
<td>Mentioned some relevant theories and literature and related to study topic</td>
<td>Paraphrased a number of relevant theories and literature and related to study focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of range of theories and relevant literature to inform focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to situate investigate focus and design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method Ethics consideration</td>
<td>Listed and partially described choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques</td>
<td>Described adequately choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, reliability)</td>
<td>Considered ethical issues and described outcomes</td>
<td>Justified in some detail choice and use of method and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collation Analysis</td>
<td>Collating/collated adequate data</td>
<td>Collating/collated relevant data</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in application of analysis techniques</td>
<td>Collating/collated relevant and accurate data</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of (preliminary) findings, conclusions</td>
<td>Did not comment on findings</td>
<td>Commented on findings</td>
<td>Discussed findings</td>
<td>Discussed potential strengths and weaknesses in project, related to findings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Inadequate description of project</td>
<td>Adequate summary of highlights of project but outside word limit</td>
<td>Good summary of project, included aims, methodology, findings and conclusions, outside word limit</td>
<td>Comprehensive summary of project, within word limit (250-300 words)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting for presentation</td>
<td>Poorly organised</td>
<td>Grammatical and/or language mistakes leading to some confusion</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in language, grammar or referencing</td>
<td>Organised according to expected standards</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD reflection</td>
<td>Commented only on ethics committee issues</td>
<td>Commented on human ethics committee difficulties and plans for future work</td>
<td>Commented on investigatory challenges encountered and some changes for future studies</td>
<td>Reflected on strengths of process, scope, limitations and ethical challenges, with plans for future studies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall score must reach 60% for the assessment to be satisfactory  
Total: /50
### Appendix 5.2 Assessment Rubrics for Oral Presentations (For use before April 2019)

**RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN**

**ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR ORAL PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH IN PROGRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed a research project relevant to Medical Administration Developed background and hypothesis</td>
<td>Mentioned some relevant theories and literature and related to study topic</td>
<td>Paraphrased a number of relevant theories and literature and related to study focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of range of theories and relevant literature to inform focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to situate research focus and design</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method Data collation Analysis</td>
<td>Listed and partially described choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques Collating data that will be inadequate for relevant analysis</td>
<td>Described adequately choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, reliability) Collating adequate data</td>
<td>Justified in some detail choice and use of method and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability) Collating relevant data</td>
<td>Explicitly justified in detail choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability) Collating relevant and accurate data Analysis correctly planned</td>
<td>/ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics consideration</td>
<td>Did not mention human research ethics issues</td>
<td>Considered ethical issues and described outcomes</td>
<td>Considered ethical issues and described rationale Submitted appropriate ethics review application</td>
<td>Considered ethical issues and described rationale Finalised and identified actions for ethics endorsement</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of preliminary findings if available/Expected findings Likely conclusions Research progress reflection</td>
<td>Did not comment on findings Drew incorrect conclusions Commented only on ethics committee issues</td>
<td>Commented on initial literature findings Commented on human ethics committee difficulties and plans for future work</td>
<td>Made comments on findings related to literature Commented on research challenges encountered and some changes for future studies</td>
<td>Discussed potential strengths and weaknesses in project, related to literature Reflected on strengths of process, scope, limitations and ethical challenges, with plans for future study</td>
<td>/ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Inadequate description of project Adequate summary of highlights of project but outside word limit</td>
<td>Good summary of project, included aims, methodology, findings and conclusions, slightly outside word limit</td>
<td>Comprehensive summary of project, within word limit (250-300 words)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting for presentation</td>
<td>Poorly organised Incorrect referencing Grammatical and/or language mistakes leading to some confusion Some variation in standard approach to presentation outline Referencing occasionally incorrect</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in language, grammar or referencing Tables and graphs clear Language and text on slides appropriate Organised according to standard approach to report outlining</td>
<td>Organised according to expected standards Employed extensive, correct and relevant discipline specific vocabulary. Correct grammar and language for oral presentation Appropriate number of slides, readable Tables and graphs labelled to indicate trending, highlights of evidence Timing appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall score must reach 60% for the assessment to be satisfactory

**Total** /50
### 5.2.2 Assessment Rubrics – completed research study - 70% content, 30% communication (Before April 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed a research project relevant to Medical Administration Developed appropriate background and hypothesis</td>
<td>Mentioned some relevant theories and research literature and related to study topic</td>
<td>Paraphrased a number of relevant theories and literature and related to study focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to inform research focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to situate research focus and design</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method</td>
<td>Listed and partially described choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques</td>
<td>Described adequately choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>Justified in some detail choice and use of method and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>Explicitly justified in detail choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collation</td>
<td>Collated inadequate data for relevant analysis</td>
<td>Collated adequate data</td>
<td>Collated relevant data</td>
<td>Collated relevant and accurate data</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Descriptive data not valid for analysis</td>
<td>Some mistakes in interpretation</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in application of analysis techniques</td>
<td>Analysed correctly</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Interpretation</td>
<td>Did not comment on findings</td>
<td>Commented on findings</td>
<td>Made comments on findings related to literature</td>
<td>Discussed strengths and weaknesses in project, related to literature</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Drew incorrect conclusions</td>
<td>Drew some conclusions substantiated by evidence from study</td>
<td>Drew relevant conclusions substantiated by aspects of evidence</td>
<td>Drew valid conclusions from evidence in study, made recommendations</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research reflection</td>
<td>Commented only on ethics committee issues</td>
<td>Commented on human ethics committee difficulties and plans for future work</td>
<td>Commented on difficulties encountered and some changes for future studies</td>
<td>Commented on strengths of process, scope, limitations and ethical challenges, with plans for future study</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Inadequate description of project</td>
<td>Adequate summary of highlights of project but outside word limit</td>
<td>Good summary of project, included aims, methodology, findings and conclusions, slightly outside word limit</td>
<td>Comprehensive summary of project, within word limit (250-300 words)</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting for presentation</td>
<td>Poorly organised</td>
<td>Some variation in standard approach to presentation outline</td>
<td>Organised according to standard approach to report presentation</td>
<td>Organised according to expected standards Employed extensive, correct and relevant discipline specific vocabulary, Correct grammar and language for oral presentation</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of presentation</td>
<td>Incorrect referencing</td>
<td>Text adequate Graphs truthful but lacking in appropriate labelling and/or font too small Referencing occasionally incorrect</td>
<td>Minor flaws in number of slides and text font readability Tables and graphs readable Appropriate referencing</td>
<td>Appropriate number of slides, readable Tables and graphs labelled to indicate trending, highlights of evidence Appropriate referencing</td>
<td>/ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall score must reach 60% for the assessment to be satisfactory

Total /50
FEEDBACK FROM ORAL PRESENTATIONS

CANDIDATE NAME: ........................................ DATE: .................................................................

SATISFACTORY [ ] UNSATISFACTORY [ ]

RTD Assessor’s Feedback

RTD Assessor’s Name: ______________________________________

RTD Assessor’s Signature: _________________________________
Appendix 6  Assessment Rubrics for Written Report of RTD Project

RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR WRITTEN REPORT

(70% Content, 30% Communication)

Candidate: ........................................................................................................... Word Count: ...........................................................................................................

Title of Paper: ........................................................................................................

Project option:  □  Health services research  □  Quality management project

□  Systematic literature review  □  Bio-ethical disputaion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed an investigatory project relevant to Medical Administration Developed appropriate background and hypothesis</td>
<td>Mentioned some relevant theories and literature and related to study topic</td>
<td>Drew on a limited number of relevant theories and literature and related to study focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to inform study focus and design</td>
<td>Drew on relevant selection of a range of theories and relevant literature to situate study focus and design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology method</td>
<td>Listed and partially described choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques</td>
<td>Described adequately choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>Justified in some detail choice and use of method and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td>Explicitly justified in detail choice and use of methodology and analysis techniques (relevance, rigour, reliability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collation</td>
<td>Collated inadequate data for relevant analysis</td>
<td>Collated some irrelevant data</td>
<td>Collated relevant data</td>
<td>Collated relevant and accurate data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Descriptive data not valid for analysis</td>
<td>Some mistakes in interpretation</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in application of analysis techniques</td>
<td>Analysed correctly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Interpretation</td>
<td>Did not comment on findings</td>
<td>Commented on findings</td>
<td>Made comments on findings and related to literature</td>
<td>Discussed strengths and weaknesses in project, related to literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Drew incorrect conclusions</td>
<td>Drew some conclusions substantiated by evidence from study</td>
<td>Drew relevant conclusions substantiated by aspects of evidence</td>
<td>Drew valid conclusions from evidence in study, Made recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research reflection</td>
<td>Commented only on ethics committee issues</td>
<td>Commented on human ethics committee difficulties and plans for future work</td>
<td>Commented on all difficulties encountered and some changes for future studies</td>
<td>Commented on strengths of process, scope, limitations and ethical challenges, with plans for future study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Inadequate description of project</td>
<td>Adequate summary of highlights of project but outside word limit</td>
<td>Good summary of project, included aims, methodology, findings and conclusions, slightly outside word limit</td>
<td>Comprehensive summary of project, within word limit (250-300 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting for written report-writing</td>
<td>Poorly organised</td>
<td>Some variation in standard approach to presentation outline</td>
<td>Organised according to standard approach to report writing</td>
<td>Organised according to expected standards of publication-ready reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical and/or language mistakes leading to some confusion</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in language, grammar</td>
<td>Tables and graphs clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referencing occasionally incorrect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referencing and bibliography</td>
<td>Incorrect referencing</td>
<td>Occasional incorrect formatting</td>
<td>Correct formatting, occasional incorrect correlation</td>
<td>Consistent formatting and correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall score must reach 60% for the assessment to be satisfactory

Total: /50
Further Feedback to Candidate:

RTD Assessor’s Name: ______________________

RTD Assessor’s Signature: ___________________  Date: ___________________
Appendix 7 Credit application form

RESEARCH TRAINING DOMAIN
CREDIT APPLICATION FORM

1. Candidate details
Candidate: ___________________ Preceptor: ___________________
Candidate email: ____________ Candidate telephone number ______________

2. Qualification and study details
Please indicate which of the following degrees/projects in Health Services Research you have completed which is/are the basis for this application for credit:

☐ Health service/health systems publications or reports
☐ Masters in health services evaluation by Research
☐ PhD in health service/health systems
☐ Post-doctoral Research Project
☐ Other evidence-informed project/publications (Specify):

___________________________________________________________________________

3. Title of thesis/research project/s:
___________________________________________________________________________

University (if applicable): _________________ Year awarded (if applicable): ______
If published, please give details of title, publisher and year:
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Summary statement
Attach a statement (no more than 300 words) outlining your research study and summarising how this research is relevant to the field of medical management within a health care setting. Indicate how your study contributed knowledge to the field of medical administration. Provide copies of abstracts or publications if relevant.

5. Recognition sought:
Please indicate the tasks in the Research Training Domain for which you are seeking credit/exemption:

☐ Research methods subjects in Master’s Degree studies
☐ RTD proposal
☐ Ethics application
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