



OXFORD CENTRE OF MEDICAL EDUCATION



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

Denis O'Leary Award for Medical Educator

Assessment criteria

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

Essential criteria

The initiative will

- be innovative (20%)
- have a strong educational element linked to a clinical goal (20%)
- involve patients, carers and/or their representatives (15%)
- Reflect on evaluation from stakeholders and/or peer review (10%)
- result in demonstrable improvement in patient care (10%)

Desirable criteria

The initiative will

- be current/relevant (5%)
- demonstrate sustainable change (10%)
- lead to strengthened multi-professional collaboration (10%)

Please refer to the grid below for further explanations of the criteria.

OxME recognises that not all projects will meet all the criteria completely. If you would like to discuss your project before submitting your nomination, please email info@oxcme.uk.

EXCELLENT	STRONG	LIMITED / WEAK	CRITERIA NOT MET
Criteria: Innovative (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: 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: Involve patients, carers and/or their representatives (15%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Involvement of patients, carers and/or their representatives as key players in multiple stages of the initiative.</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Involvement of patients, carers and/or their representatives in either developing or implementation of the project.</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Patients' and or carers 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: Evaluation from stakeholders or peer review (10%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Structured rigorous evaluation of KPIs accompanied by reflection on findings by team. Conclusions being used to enhance the initiative.</p>	<p>Strong:</p> <p>Feedback from multiple stakeholders collected and analysed.</p>	<p>Limited / weak:</p> <p>Anecdotal reports of feedback from stakeholders.</p>	<p>Criteria not met:</p> <p>No evidence of feedback from stakeholders or peer review.</p>
Criteria: Criteria: Demonstrable improvement in patient care (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: 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: Lead to strengthened multi-professional collaboration (10%)			
<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Multi-professional collaboration throughout all stages of the initiative with leadership roles</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>

being shared across different professional groups			
Criteria: Current / relevant initiative (5%)			
Yes	An initiative developed within the past two years and/or one whose impact remains relevant to the current medical education community.		
No	An initiative that is either still in the planning stage, more than two years old, or no longer relevant to the current medical education community.		