

# National Recruitment to Psychiatry 2011



## Shortlisting framework for ST4 applications

### Shortlisting Process

The College has produced a shortlisting system based on recognised good practice. All eligible applicants will have their application forms double scored by trained assessors to the agreed scoring framework set out below.

The Konetic recruitment system has a facility to allow direct online scoring and this is suggested as the preferred method. The facility will be used to enter shortlisting scores for every application. The scores can be entered directly by shortlisters or by deanery administrators inputting the results provided by shortlisters.

If the online shortlisting facility is used directly by individual shortlisters they will be allocated a password protected, time limited slot and an anonymised batch of applications to score online. Shortlisters' access to applications will be closely managed by deanery administrators who will be responsible for assigning application batches, setting up and managing shortlisters' accounts by enabling / disabling them.

To further strengthen the security of the online system, shortlisters will have to activate their account by clicking on the activation link sent to their email address validated by the deaneries. They will also be asked to create their own password when accessing the Konetic system for the first time.

Shortlisting should occur in a single venue ensuring independent marking of paired applications and enabling discussions for clarification among shortlisters, but not co-markers. Schools must ensure that there is a clearly identified lead for each shortlisting session. The lead must ensure that all shortlisters are adequately trained and briefed. During the shortlisting session the lead will monitor all aspects of process and outcome to ensure consistency and fairness.

Scores should be benchmarked by the lead and it is suggested that the first five applications for any given session are re-marked to ensure that possible calibration problems are minimised.

### How applications are scored

1. Scoring panels are made up of two scorers, both of whom must have undergone training on recruitment and equal opportunities.
2. Each scoring panel will be allocated a batch of anonymised application forms to score (Part 2 of the national application form).
3. Each scorer should independently score each question using the criteria set out in the scoring framework.

Any serious concerns about an individual application should be noted and referred to the Head of School or appointed lead shortlister (see above). This would include suspected plagiarism, falsification, fabrication or concern about fitness to practise.

### Shortlisting Outcome

**An overall threshold of 30 (15 per shortlister, with no less than 7 in total from questions 11 & 12 combined) out of 94 points is required to be shortlisted.**

Offers of interviews will be made by deaneries on the basis of competitive ranking and local interview capacity. Being deemed shortlistable does not guarantee an offer of interview.

## Scoring scales

<b>1. Additional undergraduate degrees and qualifications</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>2</b>	MB with honours, or Intercolated BSc with 1st class honours
<b>1</b>	Intercolated BSc, BMSci, etc.
<b>0</b>	Unclassified degree, no prizes or honours

<b>2. Postgraduate degrees and qualifications</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>2</b>	PhD on a relevant topic; research-based or taught MD
<b>1</b>	Other relevant evidence of merit, e.g. MRCP or MRCPGP
<b>0</b>	No postgraduate qualification

<b>3. Prizes, awards and other distinctions</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>2</b>	More than one undergraduate or post graduate prize, award, or distinction
<b>1</b>	One undergraduate or postgraduate prize, award, or distinction
<b>0</b>	No prizes or distinctions

<b>4. Achievements outside medicine (note: the relevance of the achievement to the application must be made clear)</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>4</b>	One or more truly outstanding achievements, on a scale beyond the capability of most people, utilising many relevant skills and qualities
<b>3</b>	One or more outstanding achievements, on a scale that many people could achieve if so motivated, utilising many relevant skills and qualities
<b>2</b>	One or more worthwhile achievements utilising many relevant skills and qualities on a scale that many people could achieve if motivated
<b>1</b>	One or more worthwhile achievements utilising some of the relevant skills and qualities, but with little explanation of learning and development or relevance to the specialty
<b>0</b>	Statement of achievement by title alone, irrelevant statements, blank box

<b>5. Presentations</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>5</b>	International presentation
<b>4</b>	International meeting poster
<b>4</b>	National presentation
<b>3</b>	National meeting poster
<b>3</b>	Regional presentation - this must be a regional meeting e.g. College divisional meeting or equivalent where a submission for acceptance may have been made. Local meetings held at a regional base because of the small size of the specialty do not count.
<b>2</b>	Regional meeting poster - this must be a regional meeting e.g. College divisional meeting or equivalent where a submission for acceptance may have been made. Local meetings held at a regional base because of the small size of the specialty do not count.
<b>1</b>	Local presentation(s), within trainees own workplace
<b>0</b>	No presentations

<b>6. Publications and/or Research Activity (lead shortlister to check named authorship with application)</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>5</b>	First to third, or last author of more than one peer-reviewed publication
<b>4</b>	First to third, or last author of one peer-reviewed publication
<b>3</b>	One named author (any rank) of a publication. Author of published case report
<b>2</b>	Letter published
<b>1</b>	E-letter published or clear evidence of research activity as yet unpublished
<b>0</b>	No publications

<b>7. Teaching experience</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>4</b>	Actively engaged in teaching of different groups and has teaching qualification
<b>3</b>	Actively engaged in teaching of different groups and has undertaken formal training in teaching
<b>2</b>	Actively engaged in teaching of different groups
<b>1</b>	Teaching experience that every doctor might be expected to have, directed at junior colleagues and medical students
<b>0</b>	No teaching experience

<b>8. Clinical audit</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>5</b>	Has completed audit cycle and described service change
<b>4</b>	Has completed audit cycle
<b>3</b>	Has presented results of audit at departmental or educational meeting
<b>2</b>	Involved in audit but cycle not completed
<b>1</b>	Token involvement in audit
<b>0</b>	No audit activity

<b>9. Management, leadership, team working and communication skills</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>3</b>	Displays genuine understanding by way of learning e.g. study toward higher degree or having a significant managerial role or responsibility
<b>2</b>	Displays genuine involvement e.g. being part of service working group
<b>1</b>	Displays some knowledge, interest or activity e.g. course attendance, acting as representative in management forum
<b>0</b>	Answer displays no knowledge or activity

<b>10. Research skills</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>3</b>	Displays clear understanding and involvement with full description of research activity
<b>2</b>	Displays some involvement e.g. describes role in research work as well as knowledge of research method
<b>1</b>	Displays some knowledge and interest e.g. attendance at Research skills course
<b>0</b>	Answer displays no knowledge or involvement

<b>11. Evidence to support suitability to chosen psychiatric specialty</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>6</b>	Clear understanding both of self based on good evidence, and of what the specialty involves based on extensive exploration; clear reasoning
<b>5</b>	Clear description of self but only limited evidence, and knows what specialty involves; reports reasonable enquiry into specialty; clear reasoning
<b>4</b>	Some account of self but no evidence given; knows what specialty involves; reasonable evidence of enquiry into specialty; clear reasoning
<b>3</b>	Limited understanding of self, no use of feedback; limited understanding of specialty; having made some enquiries; poor reasoning
<b>2</b>	No mention of own attributes Limited understanding of specialty; little or no effort to find out about it; inadequate reasoning
<b>1</b>	No valid reasons given
<b>0</b>	Incomprehensible

<b>12. Evidence to support commitment to chosen psychiatric specialty</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring criteria</b>
<b>6</b>	Clear understanding of specialty with contemporary themes well expressed
<b>5</b>	Good understanding of current state of specialty with some contemporary themes
<b>4</b>	Understanding above that of average Ct3 in psychiatry but short of full understanding of specialty, its current challenges and themes
<b>3</b>	Understanding at level expected of any doctor with 3 years experience in psychiatry
<b>2</b>	Little knowledge or understanding displayed,
<b>1</b>	Minimal understanding shown
<b>0</b>	No exploration of specialty

## SUMMARY

<b>Question</b>	<b>Max score</b>
1. Additional undergraduate degrees & qualifications	2
2. Postgraduate degrees and qualifications	2
3. Prizes, awards and other distinctions	2
4. Achievements outside medicine	4
5. Presentations	5
6. Publications	5
7. Teaching experience	4
8. Clinical audit	5
9. Management, leadership, team work and communication skills	3
10. Research skills	3
11. Evidence to support suitability to psychiatric specialty	6
12. Evidence to support commitment to psychiatric specialty	6
<b>Max score per shortlister</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Max score per application</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Threshold required to be shortlisted (see p.1 for details)</b>	<b>30</b>