



The JASME Student, Foundation and Group Innovation Prizes: Mark Scheme

Assessment Criteria	Mark (scored out of a total of 30 points)					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of writing - 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. The work flows well as the reader is guided between sections	Good quality of writing which flows well and contains few grammatical errors	Average writing with some grammatical and spelling errors. Overall meaning is clear but the flow is disjointed at times	Poor quality of writing with multiple errors. Multiple sentences and points lack clarity	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 - What was the existing approach? - Why did this require improvement? i.e. why was the innovation required? - What evidence backs up the approach?	Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear (2) or vague (1) description of the original approach which they aim to replace - Clear (2) or vague (1) justification for their alternative approach/innovation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Supported by reference to relevant literature/evidence (1) 					
Originality - How is the educational content delivered now, compared with the existing approach(es) which	Highly innovative project which is profoundly different from existing educational approach(es). The innovation demonstrates excellent creativity and novel insight. The	Very innovative project which is clearly different from existing educational approach(es), but is not necessarily novel in the field of	Clearly innovative project which demonstrates more than just modification of the existing approach i.e. a <u>new</u> method of	Innovation which represents a modification of the original education approach rather than a new method of content delivery	Subtle modification of existing approach in place to deliver educational content	No differentiation from previous methods

<p>the innovation replaces? - Work is awarded for being creative, insightful and novel in the field of medical education; this is the essence of the innovation prizes</p>	<p>innovation brings something new to the field of medical education</p>	<p>medical education. Nonetheless creative and insightful</p>	<p>content delivery has been employed</p>			
<p>Implementation - Clarity of methods - Evidence of promoting sustainability</p>	<p>Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear (2) or vague (1) description of the methods detailing how they have implemented their innovation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Supported by reference to relevant literature/evidence (1) - Clear intent (2) or vague reference to (1) promoting future sustainability of their innovation 					
<p>Impact - Clarity of results and impact of innovation on learners - How can/has this change(d) wider educational practice</p>	<p>Marks (total of 5) awarded for each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear (2) or vague (1) summary of the results/impact of their innovation on learners. (If no results have been recorded, but there is suggestion of resulting impact then this scores 1.) - Good (2) or average (1) discussion around the significance of their work on the field of medical education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Supported by reference to relevant literature/evidence (1) 					
<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>

Criteria for Growth and Reflection

Assessment Criteria	Mark (scored out of a total of 15 points)					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Depth of Reflection - Has the reflector made an attempt to look for nuances of the issues requiring improvement and explored beyond what is immediately evident? - Is the reflection sufficiently deep, or merely scratching the surface?	Metacognitive: Valuable and insightful reflection such that the reader feels they have acquired a valuable education on the topic. The lessons shared would be useful and motivate anyone in the field of medical education to take action	Analytical: Valuable reflection and shared insights, including how the innovation applies to a broader context of personal and professional life. More detail would be helpful to consider the insights exceptional	Empathetic: Valuable reflection demonstrating some learning points and thoughts on how innovation can impact future practice, but lacking insight into how anyone looking to take action on this issue could learn from or build upon the existing approach	Descriptive: Some lessons are shared, but there is little effort to link the problem analysis with these lessons	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
Appropriate Use of Reflection Model - Systematic reflective thinking based on validated reflection theories or models	Deep and meaningful reflection based on reflection model(s) that incorporates emotional content in shaping the innovation and views presented, linking it effectively to how certain practices medical education may be influenced or changed	Analytical reflection that includes how the experience has contributed to their understanding of self, others and the wider field of medical education based on reflection model(s)	Clear attempts to demonstrate connections between learning experience and past experiences based on reflection model(s), but lacking depth of analysis	Attempts at applying reflection model(s) but lacking connections between the learning experience and past experiences	Reflection model used, but reflection does not move beyond description(s) of the learning experience	No reflection
Growth - Reflection on personal development especially in relation to improving as an educator as a result of their work	Valuable and insightful reflection which demonstrates actual or intended behavioural change aimed at improving them as an educator	Valuable and insightful reflection which <i>suggests</i> behavioural change aimed at improving them as an educator	Valuable reflection demonstrating some learning points but lacking insight into how they can/have change(d) to improve themselves as an educator	Brief reflection which highlights some learning points as a result of their work	Brief reflection without insight or learning points	No reflection