



The JASME Sir John Ellis & Intercalator Prizes: Updated Mark Scheme

Assessment Criteria	Mark					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of writing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct use of grammar, spelling and punctuation - Logical structure which flows when reading 	Excellent quality of writing which demonstrates a very high level of literary proficiency. There is a clear structure which is logical and the work flows well as the reader is guided between sections	Good quality of writing which flows well and contains few grammatical errors. The structure is sound	Average writing with some grammatical and spelling errors. Overall meaning is clear but the flow is disjointed at times and may lack a stepwise structure	Poor quality of writing with multiple errors. Multiple sentences and points lack clarity, and feels unstructured	Quality of writing is poor enough that meaning is lost and it is difficult to follow	Largely unreadable with significant difficulty understanding the piece of work
Justification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of the topic's current literature-base and why addition of their project is required 	Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of: A thorough dissection (2) or superficial discussion (1) of the current literature-base on their topic Clearly identifies (2) or vaguely alludes to (1) a niche/need for their project to contribute to the current literature-base as a justification for undertaking their project An attempt at critically analysing the quality of literature discussed (1)					
Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity, transparency and repeatability of methods - Use of literature to justify their choices - Clear and achievable aims, objectives or research questions 	Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of: Clear, transparent and repeatable (2) or brief (1) description of their methods Robust and comprehensive (2) or occasional (1) use of literature to justify their choice of methods Explicitly stated aims, objectives or research questions (1)					
Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity of results 	Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of: A results section with clearly (2) or vaguely (1) presented findings					



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depth and insightfulness of discussion using educational literature to frame their findings within the wider literature - Use of the discussion to directly address their aims, objectives or research questions 	<p>A discussion that is excellent (3), good (2) or satisfactory (1) which must include reference to educational literature (If no literature is used in the discussion the maximum score is 2)</p>					
	<p>An <u>excellent</u> discussion uses a range of references to frame their own results and demonstrate the significance of their work within the field of medical education. The candidate clearly addresses their aims, objectives or research questions and whether these have been met, and to what extent. This work is insightful and shows ingenuity and goes deeper than simply analysing their results. For example, the candidate may have created their own model or hypothesis based upon their work.</p>					
	<p>A <u>good</u> discussion uses a range of references to frame their work within the body of literature on their chosen topic but fails to capture the significance within the wider educational field. Aims, objectives or research questions are addressed but may fail to expand on the extent to which they have been answered. This work is insightful but fails to significantly expand beyond discussing their results by, for example, suggesting a hypothesis or new/modified approach.</p>					
	<p>A <u>satisfactory</u> discussion uses a limited number of references to discuss their findings and aims are not clearly addressed or answered. This discussion does not go much deeper than just fleshing out their results and fails to expand on the significance of their work within the field of medical education.</p>					
<p>Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reflection on personal development especially in relation to improving as an educator as a result of their work 	<p>Valuable and insightful reflection which demonstrates actual or intended behavioural change aimed at improving them as an educator</p>	<p>Valuable and insightful reflection which <i>suggests</i> behavioural change aimed at improving them as an educator</p>	<p>Valuable reflection demonstrating some learning points but lacking insight into how they can/have change(d) to improve themselves as an educator</p>	<p>Brief reflection which highlights some learning points as a result of their work</p>	<p>Brief reflection without insight or learning points</p>	<p>No reflection</p>
<p>Overall Impression</p>	<p>Excellent. Of a standard consistent with innovative and influential published work</p>	<p>Very good. Of a standard which could be published in a mid-level or student journal</p>	<p>Good. This would require more work before being publishable</p>	<p>Satisfactory. This piece of work is not innovative or influential, and has multiple areas requiring improvement</p>	<p>Poor. This is an underwhelming piece of work with multiple flaws</p>	<p>Very poor</p>