

Marking criteria for Part A

Criteria	Weighting	Distinction 70+	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Bare fail 40-49	Clear fail 30-39	Bad fail <30
Identify and prioritise one key global public health issue (an issue with potential global reach) in your country and/or population of choice and discuss why the chosen issue is an important problem in that context	20	Excellent evidence presented for the choice of the key global public health issues as well as for the country or population of choice (in-depth and insightful). A clear and relevant review of the literature that includes strong critical assessment.	Good evidence presented for the choice of the key global public health issues as well as for the country or population of choice. A good review of the literature that includes critical assessment.	A key global public health issues is identified and some evidence for its choice in the context of the chosen country or population is presented. The review of the literature includes a limited critical review.	A key global public health issues is identified but its importance / relevance / impact in the context of the chosen country or population is unclear (i.e. appropriate evidence to support choices not presented) Mainly descriptive review of the literature.	Fails to clearly identify a key public health issue OR fails to focus on a country or population. LIMITED review of the literature but with no critical assessment.	Fails to clearly identify a key public health issue AND fails to focus on a country or population. NO critical assessment of the literature
Discuss / critically assess current strategies being developed and instigated by implementing partners and highlight progress and challenges being faced	20	An in-depth description of current strategies being developed / instigated that makes clear their methods, aims and potential impact as well as the roles of different implementing partners in relation to each strategy. An insightful, critical and supported (references) discussion on progress and challenges being faced with a strong element of critical assessment.	Good description of current strategies being developed / instigated that makes clear the roles of different implementing partners in relation to each strategy. A detailed and relevant discussion on progress and challenges being faced with good critical assessment throughout.	Clear description of current strategies being developed / instigated. Makes clear implementing partners and their role. Adequate discussion on progress and challenges being faced with some critical assessment.	Identifies current strategies being developed / instigated and lists implementing partners. Limited discussion on progress and challenges being faced with limited or no critical assessment.	Fails to clearly identify current strategies being developed and instigated by implementing partners OR fails to make clear progress and challenges being faced.	Fails to identify current strategies being developed and instigated by implementing partners AND fails to discuss progress and challenges being faced.
Identify key global health actors involved and describe / critically assess how they play a role in tackling these problems	25	Makes clear the key global health actors involved (comprehensive approach), and for each actor provides an in-depth description and critical assessment of their role in relation to the chosen issue and setting.	Makes clear the key global health actors involved and describes well, with some critical assessment, their roles in relation to the chosen issue and setting.	Key global health actors are listed and there is a discussion, with limited critical assessment, of their roles. The link between these roles and the chosen issue and setting could be made clearer.	Key global health actors are listed and there is a limited discussion, with little or no critical assessment, of their roles. The link between these roles and the chosen issue and setting is unclear.	A number of global health actors are listed but it is not clear why they are key and what their role is. Little or no attempt to link their role with the chosen issue and setting.	Key actors not clearly identified or no indication of role or relevance for those that have been mentioned.

Criteria	Weighting	Distinction 70+	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Bare fail 40-49	Clear fail 30-39	Bad fail <30
Offer some evidenced-based ideas that might contribute to addressing the issue.	25	Highly relevant and potentially impactful suggestions put forward to address the well-defined issue within the chosen context. The evidence base for the ideas put forward is robust and clearly defined.	Relevant suggestions put forward to address the issue within the chosen context. The ideas put forward are evidence-based and clearly referenced.	Suggestions put forward but could be made clearer as to relevance to chosen issue and context. The ideas put forward are evidence based.	Suggestions are put forward, but it is unclear how they would address the issue and context. References presented but could be clearer how they support the suggestions / arguments put forward.	Suggestions are made but they lack context and the evidence base for the suggestions is not clear.	The suggestions made are out of context and no attempt to support them with evidence.
Appropriate referencing and quality of academic writing that incorporates critical thinking and a supporting figure or table	10	References are highly relevant to the point being made, used appropriately, highly credible (up to date and from appropriate sources) and are correctly referenced and cited with correct formatting. Excellent adoption of academic writing throughout. Excellent use of a supporting figure or table.	References are relevant to the point being made, used appropriately, credible (up to date and from appropriate sources), and are mainly correctly referenced and cited with mainly correct formatting. Good use of academic writing throughout Good use of a supporting figure or table	References are adequate for the point being made, mainly used appropriately, and generally credible (mostly up to date and from appropriate sources), with a few errors of formatting in reference lists and citations. A good attempt at academic writing with some errors (e.g. over interpretation of results; over use of adjectives; unsupported statements of fact....). A table or figure is presented but it could be made clearer how it supports the discussion / arguments.	References are less than adequate for the point being made, generally not used appropriately, not completely credible (many are not up to date and/or from inappropriate sources), and there are errors of formatting in reference lists and citations. Academic approach to writing could be strengthened. A table or figure is included but it is unclear why.	Limited use of references throughout. References not adequate for the point being made, and not credible (not up to date and/or from inappropriate sources), with significant errors of formatting in reference lists and citations. Poor adoption of academic writing. No table or figure presented.	References not used or inappropriate for the point being made, not credible (not up to date and/or from inappropriate sources), significant errors of formatting in reference lists and citations or missing reference list or citations. Written in a style that is not academic and no table or figure presented.
	100%						

