

For the Essay style examination under the 2012 Fellowship Program, the marking grid for the CEQ will be modified to allow greater flexibility in tailoring it to the question being asked. Each marking domain will be weighted according to its relevance to the question.

The Writtens subcommittee will choose domains that are relevant to the Critical Essay Question in the examination under consideration, then determine the relative weighting for each domain. The sub-committee will have the flexibility to choose from the following domains those that are most relevant and appropriate for the question. Not all domains will be relevant for each essay. The weightings attached to each domain may vary from examination to examination as will the key requirements and descriptors.

The revised marking domains are given below in the marking key.

Revised marking domains:

1. Fellowship Competency; Communicator

<i>The candidate demonstrates the ability to communicate clearly</i> Spelling, grammar and vocabulary adequate to the task; able to convey ideas clearly.	Proficiency level
The spelling, grammar or vocabulary significantly impedes communication.	0
The spelling, grammar and vocabulary are acceptable but the candidate demonstrates below average capacity for clear written expression.	1
The spelling, grammar and vocabulary are acceptable and the candidate demonstrates good capacity for written expression.	2
The candidate displays a highly sophisticated level of written expression.	3

2. Fellowship Competency; Scholar

<i>The candidate demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate the statement/question</i> Includes the ability to describe a valid interpretation of the statement/question.	Proficiency level
The candidate takes the statement/questions completely at face value with no attempt to explore deeper or alternative meanings.	0
One or more interpretations are made, but may be invalid, superficial or not fully capture the meaning of the statement/question.	1
The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the statement/question's meaning at superficial as well as deeper or more abstract levels.	2
One or more valid interpretations are offered that display depth and breadth of understanding around the statement/question as well as background knowledge.	3

3. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Communicator, Scholar

<i>The candidate is able to identify and develop a number of lines of argument that are relevant to the proposition.</i> <i>The candidate makes reference to the research literature where this usefully informs their arguments.</i> <i>Includes the ability to consider counter arguments and/or argue against the proposition.</i>	Proficiency level
There is no evidence of logical argument or critical reasoning; points are random or unconnected, or simply listed.	0
There is only a weak attempt at supporting the assertions made by correct and relevant knowledge OR there is only one argument OR the arguments are not well linked.	1
The points in this essay follow logically to demonstrate the argument and are adequately developed.	2
The candidate demonstrates a sophisticated level of reasoning and logical argument, and most or all the arguments are relevant.	3

4. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Scholar

<i>Information cited in the essay is factually correct.</i>	Proficiency level
There are significant errors of fact that, if used as a basis for treatment planning, could pose a risk to patients.	0
There are errors of fact that are multiple and substantial, but without the element of significant risk to patients.	1
There are no major errors of fact.	2
There are no major errors of fact and the level of relevant factual knowledge is higher than average (e.g. accurately quoted literature).	3

5. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Health Advocate, Professional

<i>The candidate demonstrates a mature understanding of broader models of health and illness, cultural sensitivity and the cultural context of psychiatry historically and in the present time, and the role of the psychiatrist as advocate and can use this understanding to critically discuss the essay question.</i>	Proficiency level
The candidate limits themselves inappropriately rigidly to the medical model OR does not demonstrate cultural awareness or sensitivity where this was clearly required OR fails to demonstrate an appropriate awareness of a relevant cultural/historical context OR fails to consider a role for psychiatrist as advocate.	0
The candidate touches on the expected areas but their ideas lack depth or breadth or are inaccurate or irrelevant to the question/statement.	1
The candidate demonstrates an acceptable level of cultural sensitivity and/or historical context and/or broader models of health and illness and/or the role of psychiatrist as advocate relevant to the question/statement.	2
The candidate demonstrates a superior level of awareness and knowledge in these areas relevant to the statement/question.	3

6. Fellowship Competency; Professional

<i>The candidate demonstrates appropriate ethical awareness</i>	Proficiency level
The candidate fails to address ethical issues where this was clearly required, or produces material that is unethical in content.	0
The candidate raises ethical issues that are not relevant or are simply listed without elaboration or are described incorrectly or so unclearly as to cloud the meaning.	1
The candidate demonstrates an appropriate awareness of relevant ethical issues.	2
The candidate demonstrates a superior level of knowledge or awareness of relevant ethical issues.	3

7. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Collaborator

<i>The candidate demonstrates understanding of patient-centred care, the recovery model in psychiatry, and the role of carers.</i>	Proficiency level
The candidate fails to consider patient-centred care.	0
The candidate mentions these concepts.	1
The candidate demonstrates understanding of patient-centred care.	2
The candidate demonstrates a superior depth or breadth of understanding of patient-centred care.	3

8. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Collaborator, Manager

<i>The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments.</i>	Proficiency level
Arguments and conclusions appear uninformed by clinical experience (no clinical link) or are contrary or inappropriate to the clinical context.	0
There is an attempt to link to the clinical context, but it is tenuous or the links made are unrealistic.	1
The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments.	2
The candidate makes links to the clinical context that appear very well-informed and show an above average level of insight.	3

9. Fellowship Competency; Medical Expert, Communicator, Scholar

<i>The candidate is able to draw a conclusion that is justified by the arguments they have raised.</i>	Proficiency level
There is no conclusion.	0
Any conclusion is poorly justified or not supported by the arguments that have been raised.	1
The candidate is able to draw a conclusion/s that is justified by the arguments they have raised.	2
The candidate demonstrates an above average level of sophistication in the conclusion/s drawn, and they are well supported by the arguments raised.	3

10. Fellowship Competency; To Be Specified

Specific to the essay under consideration (not to be >10% weighting).	Proficiency level
Not demonstrated.	0
Weakly demonstrated.	1
Adequately demonstrated.	2
Demonstrated at a superior level.	3

An example of how the new marking domains and weighting might be applied to an essay question is shown below.

Example:

Essay Question: “Propaganda is the enemy of reason and truth”

The marking grid below shows the domains chosen as relevant to this essay question, the relative weights that might be applied to these domains, and, in the ‘Key Points’ column, key points identified to assist the examiner in marking each essay.

Please note the levels of proficiency (scored 0, 1, 2 and 3 as above) are not included in the following example.

The weighting attached to each domain is a suggested weighting *specific to this essay question*.

Domain [as per marking key]	Descriptor/s	Key points	Weighting
1	The candidate demonstrates the ability to communicate clearly Spelling, grammar and vocabulary adequate to the task; able to convey ideas clearly.		10%
2	The candidate demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate the statement/question Includes the ability to describe a valid interpretation of the statement/question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to state the meaning of this statement • Outlining various meanings of propaganda is essential 	25%
3	The candidate is able to identify and develop a number of lines of argument that are relevant to the proposition. Includes the ability to consider counter arguments and/or argue against the proposition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of propaganda • Alternative interpretations of what could be called propaganda 	25%
5	The candidate demonstrates a mature understanding of broader models of health and illness, cultural sensitivity and the cultural context of psychiatry historically, and in the present time, and can use this understanding to critically discuss the essay question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychiatrists have not been immune from being caught up in propaganda and becoming political pawns e.g. Nazi Germany, Russia 	10%
6	The candidate demonstrates appropriate ethical awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for checks and balances • Independent oversight 	10%
8	The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How benign propaganda could benefit mental health 	10%
9	The candidate is able to draw a conclusion that is justified by the arguments they have raised.		15%