**Background**

Global Assessments (GAs) are used in Australian General Practice (GP) training including at selection, during in-training reviews, and within summative assessment.

**Aims**

This project aimed to determine factors influencing assessors in their assignment of a GA score.

**Method**

A modified Delphi process was used with participants recruited from GP Supervisor and Medical Educator groups nationwide. Consensus information obtained via questionnaires was reflected to the group for comment in subsequent Delphi rounds.

Demographics collected included educator role, level of experience, and number of doctors supervised. Participants were asked where they had performed GAs, and the factors they considered when making a GA. Participants ranked these factors independently, and in relation to training level of the doctor being observed, as well as commenting on consensus rankings. Participants rated their confidence in GAs as an accurate determinant of GP competence, to identify personal biases, and their approach to discrepancies in GA scores.

**Results**

A total of 28 participants engaged in 4 Delphi rounds. GAs were most commonly used in direct observation of practice. Clinical knowledge, conscious incompetence, communication skills and help-seeking practices were ranked highly. There was good agreement regarding criteria significance across the training continuum and the robustness of GA. There was conflicting opinion about what skills and factors can be learnt versus what should be inherent.

**Conclusion**

The factors contributing to a GA are not limited to assessment of knowledge and skills, but include the non-clinical domains, namely communication, professionalism and organisational skills. Trust in the validity of GA by participants was strong. Personal biases do exist, and it is unknown whether or how these are overcome when making final judgment. The strength of GA appears to be drawn from the breadth of factors considered that go beyond ‘clinical’ checklists, by allowing for overall impressions and gut feeling, providing a ‘rounded approach’ to assessing competency.