



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A thorough dissection (2) or superficial discussion (1) of the current literature-base on their topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o An attempt at critically analysing the quality of literature discussed (1) - 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 					
Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity, transparency and repeatability of methods - Use of literature to justify their choices 	Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explicitly stated aims, objectives or research questions (1) - 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 					



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear and achievable aims, objectives or research questions 						
<p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity of results - 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>Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A results section with clearly (2) or vaguely (1) presented findings - A discussion that is excellent (3), good (2) or satisfactory (1) which must include contextually relevant references to educational literature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o (If no literature is used in the discussion the maximum score is 2) <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>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</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>



Criteria for Growth and Reflection

Assessment Criteria	Mark (scored out of a total of 12 points)					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Appropriate Use of Reflection Model Systematic reflective thinking based on validated reflection theories or models				Reflective model used appropriately to support active reflection connections between the learning experience and past experiences	Attempts at applying reflection model(s) but lacking connections between the learning experience and past experiences	No reflective model used
Depth of Reflection - Has the reflector made an attempt to look for nuances and explored beyond what is immediately evident? - Is the reflection sufficiently deep?	Metacognitive: In addition to (4) demonstrates metacognition (awareness of one's oneself or thought processes) including high levels of detail which represent insightful reflection	Analytical: Valuable reflection and shared insights, including how the innovation applies to a broader context. More detail would be helpful to consider the insights excellent	Analytical: Valuable reflection demonstrating some learning points and thoughts on the impact of the innovation, but lacking deeper insight into how to learn from or build upon the existing approach	Descriptive: A number of lessons are shared, but there is little effort to link these with any analysis or reflection	Descriptive: Very few lessons are drawn from the applicant's work. It seems like a repetition of facts rather than their own analysis and comparison across various perspectives	No reflection
Growth - Reflection on personal development - Relation to improvement as an educator	Valuable and insightful reflection which <i>demonstrates</i> actual or intended behavioural change as a result of personal and professional development as an educator.	Valuable and insightful reflection which <i>suggests</i> behavioural change as a result of personal and professional development as an educator.	Good reflection demonstrating some insight into personal or professional development as a result of the project	Brief reflection which highlights some areas or personal or professional growth as a result of their work	Brief reflection without mention of personal or professional growth	No reflection