Assessment Criteria for Ireland Medical & Dental Research Competition

Assessment Criteria for Quality Improvement Projects (QIP)

	Entries that will receive high scores	Entries that will receive middle-range scores	Entries that will receive low scores
Category 1 Criteria: Quality Improvement Project (QIP)	**Grade as 5 or 4**	**Grade as 3 or 2**	**Grade as 1 or 0**
Framework to carry out the QIP.	It has a very clear framework.	has a partially defined framework	Has no or poorly defined framework
The focus of the QIP (the issue/challenge/problem)	The issue that requires improvement or needs to be resolved is clearly defined. E.g., reference to previous audits or recent literature/publications	Shows a good understanding of the likely problems/areas that need improvement, but with no data or evidence to support the hypothesis.	The issue that requires improvement or needs to be resolved with no understanding of the problem or the improvement needed
Impact of the issue	the impact that the issues are having (e.g., on patients, staff, the practice) has been quantified supported by references/evidence about impact and outcomes	The impact of the issue is partially quantified with understanding of the likely improvement, but without specific measurements such as e.g., improved behavioural change or other outcomes, no reference to the literature.	the impact of the issue is not quantified
The cause of the issue	The cause of the issue is identified	The cause of the issue is partially identified	The cause of the issue is not identified
Rationale for the solution(s) to the issue	A clear rationale for the solution(s) to the issue that is well informed by literature and reference to appropriate guidelines:	May have a rationale for the solution(s) to the issue but partially informed by literature. Reference to appropriate bodies but no specific reference to guidelines, or the relevant parts of the guidelines	Unclear rationale for the solution(s) which is not informed by literature
Implementation of solution(s).	Shows the use of a suitable method within the QIP framework to implement the solution and shows how it is verified	Method used works but not the most suitable approach for the QIP under consideration	Does no use a suitable method within the QIP framework to implement the solution
The impact/expected impact of implementing the solution(s)	Evaluation to show impact of implementing the identified solution(s)	Plans to evaluate the impact but have not been undertaken or undertaken in a satisfactory manner	No evaluation to show impact of implementing the identified solution(s)
Dissemination of the (potential) impact to make a difference.	Evidence of communication of the outcomes of the QIP to the relevant audiences (or a clear plan to do so)	Mention of some ways in which the outcomes of the QIP have been communicated or will be communicated but does not appear to be fully explored or considered	No evidence of, or a plan to communication of the outcomes of the QIP to the relevant audiences (or a clear plan to do so)
Overall impression	Well laid out and structured. Easy to read. A logical flow of information. Good spelling and grammar.	There is a narrative, but the submission could be better structured and communicated	Not much consideration is given to the structure or layout of the submission. Difficult to read and follow the concepts and narrative being communicated

Assessment Criteria for Case Presentations

Category 2 Criteria: Presentation of a case preceded by a mini systematic review	**Entries that will receive high scores**	**Entries that will receive middle-range scores**	**Entries that will receive low scores**
	Grade as 5 or 4	**Grade as 3 or 2**	**Grade as 1 or 0**
Critical appraisal and review of the relevant literature.	A clear rationale that is well informed by review of the relevant literature. Specific reference to appropriate aspects of all the relevant guidelines	May have a clear rationale but partially informed by literature. General reference to some of the guidelines with support from some literature, but not specific enough	Unclear rationale which is not informed by literature
Issues/challenges of the case	The issues/challenges of the case well described and presented	The issues/challenges of the case partially described and presented	The issues/challenges of the case poorly described and presented
Evidence informed management of the case presented	Clearly show how the evidence informed the entrant's practice, and their management of the case presented. Clear decision-making post initial therapy and justification for this with evidence of treating the patient as an individual – e.g. personalised records reference to relevant medical history, identifying barriers to changing behaviour etc.; evidence of ensuring the patient is clear about their own role in treatment outcomes	Sensible decision making, but lacking some specific detail or missing one or two key considerations	Management of the case presented not informed by the evidence from the literature with no detail nor key consideration
Outcome(s) of the management of the case.	Well written and presented outcome(s) of the management of the case.	Outcomes presented but could have been better presented	Poorly written and presented outcome(s) of the management of the case.
Reflections on the case and its management	Insightful reflections on how multiple facets of the case was managed	Some reflections on how multiple facets of the case was managed	No or poor reflection on how the case was managed
Overall impression	Well laid out and structured. Easy to read. A logical flow of information. Good spelling and grammar	There is a narrative, but the submission could be better structured and communicated	Not much consideration is given to the structure or layout of the submission. Difficult to read and follow the concepts and narrative being communicated

Assessment Criteria for Small Scale Practice-based Research

Category 3 Criteria: Small-scale practice-based research	**Entries that will receive high scores** **Grade as 5 or 4**	**Entries that will receive middle-range scores** **Grade as 3 or 2**	**Entries that will receive low scores** **Grade as 1 or 0**
Research question	A strong and relevant research question	A relevant research question	An irrelevant research question
Literature review	An adequate and relevant literature review that provides a clear rationale for the research	A relevant literature review that provides a rationale for the research	An inadequate literature review on which the rationale for the research is based
Aims and objectives.	Clear and relevant aims and objectives to the research question.	Aims and objectives with partial relevance to the research question.	Aims and objectives irrelevant to the research question.
Methodology	Appropriate methodology for research questions and design.	Method used works but not the most suitable approach for the topic under consideration	Inappropriate methodology for the research question and design.
Data management and analysis.	Explanation of how the data collected was managed and analysed.	How the project data collected and managed explained to some extent but not fully	No explanation of how the data collected was managed and analysed.
Results.	Clearly presented and explained results.	Results presented but could be explained better	Poorly presented and explained results
Discussion section	A good discussion section that shows understanding of the results, literature and implications.	A discussion section that shows some understanding of the results, literature and implications.	A discussion section that shows poor understanding of the results, literature and implications.
Conclusions	Conclusions that are supported by the findings and linked to the aims and objectives.	Conclusions that may be supported by the findings but not aligned to the aims and objectives.	Conclusions that are not supported by the findings and are not aligned to the aims and objectives.
Dissemination of findings	Evidence of communication of the outcomes of the research to the relevant audiences (or a clear plan to do so)	Mention of some ways in which the outcomes of the research have been communicated or will be communicated but does not appear to be fully explored or considered	No evidence of, or a plan to communicate of the outcomes of the research to the relevant audiences (or a clear plan to do so)
Overall impression	Well laid out and structured. Easy to read. A logical flow of information. Good spelling and grammar.	There is a narrative, but the submission could be better structured and communicated	Not much consideration is given to the structure or layout of the submission. Difficult to read and follow the concepts and narrative being communicated