

Exam Marking

D Vijayasankar

Writing - Mandatory

- Vancouver referencing 11 point
- Double spaced, Arial or Times New Roman font
- Electronic submission in Word format
- Headings- Use headings in the written mark sheet
- Frontspiece - Executive summary, signatures from candidate and trainer confirming sole work of candidate
- Word limit: >2000 words and <6000 words (excluding tables, diagrams and references and appendices if used)

Written Mark Sheet

Appendix 5a Written QIP mark sheet

	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Comments
Issue/topic	No description of issue or why important for department, no context given	Clear concise description of problem with impact on patient care – why important in this department	
Presentation, narrative, structure	Multiple spelling mistakes, incorrect underlining/ use of bold, tables poor, incoherent narrative and unable to determine the project progress	Grammar acceptable, good use of language, tables simple and demonstrates relevant points clearly, logical structure, easy to follow and could be replicated	
Identification/ analysis of the cause of the problem	Failure to analyse the problem sufficiently or identify root cause	Good clear analysis and identification of the cause of the problem	
Evidence found	No attempt to look for published solutions, no access to known resources for support, no critique of evidence found	Good search and critical review of evidence to support change	
Structure and implementation of change	No description of mechanism/ approach to change, no outline of the project plan	Clear implementation of changes, including description of tasks/ deadlines, monitoring and managing progress, all following logically from planning stage	

Written Mark Sheet

	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Comments
Measuring outcomes	Limited measurement or assessment of impact of QIP	Develops/identifies tools to assess outcomes, implements the tool effectively	
Engagement and team working	Limited or unexplained engagement with team, no evidence of team working	Good evidence of engagement with team, minutes of meetings, discussion of options	
Iterative process	Limited evidence of iterative process, response to results or next steps implementation	Good evidence of monitoring response to change, further changes planned clearly or undertaken	
Reflection	Limited reflection on process	Reflection on both personal and institutional learning – suggestions for how this might be shared, or how might have done things differently	
Overall	Written report – ring one outcome Successful – only one unacceptable, or all acceptable Unsuccessful – more than one unacceptable		

Appendix 2b QIP – viva mark sheet

	Unacceptable	Excellent	
Overview of project	Unable to concisely summarise and give salient points	Good description of project – full but concise	
Discussion of change plans	Unable to explain why the change was implemented, the analysis of the cause	Clear description of original problem, causes and why change was chosen	
Implementation	Chaotic description of implementation	Clear implementation overview, tasks, deadlines, rationale, including planning and milestones	
Measuring and outcomes	Limited identification of the outcomes to be measured and results – limited analysis of implications of results	Able to explain measures, results and implications – and link to what was originally required	
Reflection	Limited reflection – unable to describe benefits of QIP or limitations of the project as undertaken	Can describe further improvements, how could do better next time, how project has been sustained or further modified	
Overall	Successful in the domain marked unsuccessful in the written AND only one unsuccessful in viva = successful completion More than one unsuccessful in viva or continued unsuccessful in the written domain = unsuccessful		

Marking

- Plagiarism checked
- Senior examiner lead for QI – Reads all QIP
- Two examiners allocated to mark your QIP
- Examiners will not examine the trainees/non-trainees known to them
- Each examiner marks the QI based on the marking sheet individually

Before Marking

- Almost all examiners will review your evidence
- Almost all examiners will check the data you have written
- Checks for spelling and grammatical errors
- Highlight areas of interest and take notes
- Critically appraise
- Then start marking according to RCEM standards

Marking

- Each examiner marks the paper
- Sends their marks to RCEM before the exam day
- On the day – Both examiners will go through their marking with their fellow examiner and agree with common marks.
- Most of the time – both the examiner marks match
- Common marks are then transcribed to marking sheet with comments before the viva

Viva

- No viva after Aug 2018
- Successful and unsuccessful is based on written component
- Set Pattern
- One examiner asking questions
- Second examiner taking notes
- At times second examiner might ask questions as well



Viva

- Always a summary – Maximum 2 mins
- Why chosen / what triggered
- How you derived it and what is the patient benefit
- Management tools used and obstacles
- Outcome and process measures chosen and why
- Is it sustainable
- Further steps, learning from the study



Viva

- Process / Measures/ Analysis
 - What made you choose this particular process / measures
 - Explain your rationale for choosing this measure
 - Why did you not use for example: Six Sigma/ Lean, Fish bone (cause and effect)
 - Is your study an outcome or process measure
 - Balancing measures - Are changes designed to improve one part of the system causing new problems in other parts of the system
 - Eg: For reducing time patients spend in ED with # NOF: Make sure not to miss the organic cause of fall eg: Aneurysm/PE/Syncope etc



Writing

- Marking standard is well established
- Candidate has to show
 - Issue or topic of interest
 - Good narrative avoiding grammatical and spelling errors
 - Analysis of current process/ problems
 - Literature review and some analysis of individual or important studies



Writing

- Candidate has to show
 - Description of change and Quality improvement process (project plan, tools used, etc) – need evidence
 - What balancing measures were chosen
 - Team chosen (Stakeholders) and why and evidence of engagement with stakeholders and how the barriers were resolved
 - What data was chosen and what did it reveal
 - Outcome effects of QIP and remedial action after each change of process (eg: multiple PDSA cycles)
 - Reflection and lessons learnt– high marks in writing

Sample Heading - One

- First Page
 - Heading
 - Declaration
 - Signature of candidate and supervisor for the project
 - Word count

Sample Headings - One

- Executive summary (Like writing a 200 word summary of a critical appraisal paper without the use of subheadings)
- Issue / Topic and Background
- Identification and Analysis of the cause of the problem
- Evidence found
- Structure and implementation of change
- Measuring outcomes
- Engagement and team working
- Iterative process
- Reflection

Appendices and References

- Appendices - example
 - Stake holder engagement meetings
 - Minutes
 - Educational presentation
 - Presentation at regional meetings
 - Prizes
 - Your own learning – e-learning
 - Email transcripts, etc

Questions



Thank you and Good Luck

EoE EM Team
Adrian, Anita, Jane and Vijay

