



OXFORD CENTRE OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

Member of the Association for Medical Education in Europe (AMEE)



Email: info@oxcme.uk
Website: www.oxcme.uk

Denis O'Leary Award for Medical Educator

Marking criteria

For clarity and consistency, all applications are marked using the following criteria

Essential criteria

The initiative will

- be innovative i.e. a new initiative (20%)
- have a strong educational element linked to a clinical goal (20%)
- demonstrate improvement in patient care as a result of the educational initiative. (10%)

Desirable criteria

The initiative will

- have taken place in the preceding year (5%)
- demonstrate sustainable change (10%)
- involve patients in the educational intervention (15%)
- lead to strengthened multi-professional collaboration (15%)
- positive evaluation from stakeholders or been peer reviewed (5%)

EXCELLENT	STRONG	LIMITED / WEAK	CRITERIA NOT MET
Criteria: Innovative i.e. a new initiative (20%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Demonstrates novel and highly effective approaches throughout the project, using reflection to adapt and improve the project to achieve the desired outcome.</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Demonstrates fresh thinking and realistic approaches, drawing on theory and practice in response to an existing challenge.</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Project largely based on existing ideas or previous project, with some modification</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>Replication of previous project without any change, new ideas or new approach</p>
Criteria: Have a strong educational element linked to a clinical goal (20%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Project / course has a clear clinical goal which clearly informs the development and implementation of the initiative.</p> <p>All stakeholders are actively supported in reflecting and learning throughout the project.</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Project / course has a clinical goal which underpins most of the activities.</p> <p>Specific activities are incorporated into the project activities to provide spaces for learning for key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>The clinical goal is articulated with at least some activities directed towards its achievement.</p> <p>There is evidence of learning within the team, although not widely across all stakeholders.</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>Lacks a clear clinical goal and / or does not include an educational element to achieve change.</p>
Criteria: Demonstrate improvement in patient care as a result of the educational initiative (10%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Clear direct evidence (quantitative or qualitative) of improvement e.g. improvement of patient care KPIs</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Indirect evidence (quantitative or qualitative) of improvement of patient care e.g. patient satisfaction, case report</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Direct or indirect evidence of improvement in doctors of AHP practice (knowledge, skills or professionalism) which in turn may improve patient care</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of improvement in quality of practice or patient care</p>
Criteria: Taken place in the preceding year (5%)			
Yes	Project activities have taken place since 01.09.2018		
No	Project completed prior to 31.08.2018		

Criteria: Demonstrate sustainable change (10%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Explicit reporting of how the initiative will be sustained, e.g. future funding secured or new content incorporated into existing curriculum</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Evidence of specific planning for sustainability being integral to the initiative, possibly through using one of the sustainability models (e.g. Coburn's model).</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Evidence that some of the impact of the initiative may continue to some extent past the intervention stage of the initiative</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of considering the sustainability of changes</p>
Criteria: Involve patients in the educational intervention (15%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Direct involvement of patient(s) as key players in multiple stages of the initiative</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Involvement of patients, carers or their representatives in either developing or implementation of the project</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Patients' voices and views explicitly considered in developing the project.</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of considering patients' voices or views in developing or delivering the project / course</p>
Criteria: Lead to strengthened multi-professional collaboration (15%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Multi-professional collaboration throughout all stages of the initiative with leadership roles being shared across different professional groups</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Multi-professional collaboration developing and planning stages of the initiative</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Some evidence of involvement of different professional groups in the initiative</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of multi-professional involvement</p>
Criteria: Positive evaluation from stakeholders or been peer reviewed (5%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Structured rigorous evaluation of KPIs accompanied by reflection on findings by team</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Successful peer review e.g. publication in a journal or conference presentation</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Obtaining feedback from stakeholders embedded in project</p> <p>Submission for publication and/or conference presentation</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Anecdotal reports of positive feedback from stakeholders</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of feedback from stakeholders or peer review</p>