The SP is the most exciting part of the summative assessments for the RANZCP
You can shine.
You drive this
You can choose what you focus on and how you do it
You can create a new pathway for your career, new recognition of your skills, new change in a service or the future processes for psychiatry.
You can bring to attention of colleagues areas of psychiatry and mental health not previously focused on!
HUGE opportunity
Introduction

- The Scholarly Project (SP) is a summative assessment of the 2012 Fellowship Program. It has been designed to help trainees meet the Fellowship Competencies, particularly in the CanMEDS Framework role of Scholar. It involves the submission of original research in an area relevant to psychiatry or mental health.

- It is one of 5 centrally administered assessments:
  - Writtens - Multiple choice style (MCQ) and Essay-style (CEQ & MEQ)
  - OSCE
  - Scholarly Project
  - Psychotherapy Written Case
Introduction

- It should be successfully completed by 60 months full-time equivalent training. The recent extension to 72 months requires Targeted Learning component.

- Trainees **must** pass the Scholarly Project assessment to be eligible for Fellowship.

- The Scholarly Project will contribute to a trainee’s ability to achieve the Scholar learning outcomes including, but not limited to:
  - Critically evaluate academic material
  - Demonstrate knowledge of research methodologies
  - Generate research of peer-review quality
Scholarly Project in the training trajectory

Intended to provide a trainee (or trainees) with a baseline against which their progress will be monitored to ensure a steady progression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE months*</th>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation EPAs</td>
<td>ITA with associated OCA + 2 EPAs</td>
<td>ITA with associated OCA + 2 EPAs</td>
<td>ITA with associated OCA + 2 EPAs</td>
<td>ITA with associated OCA + 2 EPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 General Psychiatry EPAs x 4</td>
<td>1 of the 4 eg. ECT</td>
<td>1 of the 4 eg. Risk Assessment</td>
<td>1 of the 4 eg. Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>1 of the 4 eg. Mental Health Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 Psychotherapy EPAs x 3</td>
<td>2 EPAs must be completed by the end of Stage 2</td>
<td>1 of the 3 eg. Therapeutic alliance</td>
<td>1 of the 3 eg. Supportive Psychotherapy</td>
<td>1 of the 3 eg. CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Mandatory Stage 2 EPAs</td>
<td>eg. 1 ADD EPA (if not elective rotation)</td>
<td>eg. 1 ADD EPA (if not elective rotation)</td>
<td>eg. 2 POA EPAs (if not elective rotation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCQ Exam</td>
<td>Eligible to apply &gt; 0 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCQ Paper Pass</td>
<td>TL = 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ and CEQ Examinations</td>
<td>Eligible to apply &gt; 18 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ &amp; CEQ Pass</td>
<td>TL = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Eligible to apply &gt; 36 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSCE Pass</td>
<td>TL = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Project</td>
<td>eg. Proposal/Method outline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly Pass</td>
<td>TL = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapy Written Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Case Pass</td>
<td>TL = 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TL = Targeted Learning (Mandatory)
TR = Training Review Application to the Committee for Training (Mandatory)
BIT = Break In Training

* = Months of accredited training time
= Psychotherapy EPAs: Must attain any 2 of the 3 Psychotherapy EPAs by the end of Stage 2. The third one can be attained by the end of Stage 3, still to a proficient standard.
# = Must be pre-approved by the Director of Training.
Structure of education committees in the College

- Structure

  Education Committee

  Committee for Training
  Committee for Examinations
  Several other groups

  Subcommittees of the Committee for Examinations
  SPSC, Writtens, OSCE, CHSC
### Scholarly Project Subcommittee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chair</strong></th>
<th>A/Prof Jeremy Couper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td>Up to 12 members from all states and NZ with gender diversity, broad range of academic, training and clinical roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to co-opt members for specific purposes and to recruit expert markers for particular topics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So why a Scholarly Project

“The successful completion of a College-approved Scholarly Project is a requirement of the 2012 Fellowship Program. The Scholarly Project has been designed to help trainees meet the Fellowship Competencies, particularly in the CanMEDS Framework role of Scholar. The Scholarly Project will contribute to a trainee’s ability to achieve the Scholar learning outcomes including, but not limited to:

- Critically evaluate academic material (mapped to Stage 1).
- Demonstrate knowledge of research methodologies (mapped to Stage 2).
- Generate research of peer-review quality (Stage 3).”
Required Basics for any ASSESSMENT- understand what is required ……

- This assessment counts- you have to pass it….
- Read and Know and follow the SP policy and procedures
  There are 2 pathways:
  – Scholarly Project
  – Exemption for an equivalent project

- Don’t rely on your clinical supervisor to know the P&P as it is outside their usual training role.
- Don’t rely on casual information. Do the work of reading, read it all and work out what is needed.
- Follow updates in the trainee newsletters - on the website.
WHEN SHOULD I DO THE SP

• ASAP
• Or develop a plan for progress through the 2012 training

What I would do…

• First year – learn the system, settle into MEC and plan rotation needs
• Second year 1\textsuperscript{st} half – start psychotherapy client
• Second year 2\textsuperscript{nd} half – start SP and finish PMC and write and submit (Nov)
• Third – Complete SP and submit, do MCQ
• Fourth do Clinical writtens and OSCE- with a chance to have to re-do one
• “Generate research of peer-review quality”
  = generate research at the level suitable for publication in a peer reviewed journal.
• Does not have to be published but has to fulfil the requirements of a formal report.
• The presentation and content are clear and concise.
• Professional English is used with appropriate spelling and grammar. (Trainees are advised to have their project proofread).
• The project is 3000–5000 words.
• Evidence of local ethics committee approval is provided where relevant.
• The content conforms to the requirements for the type of project submitted per the Scholarly Project Procedure.
## OUTCOMES AND BACKGROUND 2021

### Number of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>March 2021</th>
<th>July 2021</th>
<th>November 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>142 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Pass</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total submissions</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Options</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
<th>Pass (including Conditional Pass)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original empirical research (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic and critical literature review</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholarly Project Proposals

- Total proposals received till December 2021

Types of approved SP proposal (Oct 2013 - Dec 2021)
- Case Report: 194, 24%
- Literature Review: 327, 41%
- Qualitative/Quantitative Research: 245, 31%
- Quality Assurance Project / Clinical Audit: 25, 3%
- Other: 11, 1%

Number of Approved SP proposal per state (Oct 2013 - Dec 2021)
- QLD: 327, 22%
- NSW: 327, 31%
- VIC: 194, 19%
- WA: 11, 10%
- SA: 11, 5%
- NZ: 11, 9%
- ACT: 11, 2%
- NT: 11, 1%
Scholarly Project Exemptions

- Total exemptions received till October 2021

**Total Exemptions till October 2021**

- Prior Study, 131, 29%
- Previous Publication, 267, 60%
- Both/Multiple, 38, 9%
- Other Project, 8, 2%

**Exemptions Granted till October 2021**

- Prior Study, 107, 31%
- Previous Publication, 208, 59%
- Both/Multiple, 30, 9%
- Other Project, 5, 1%
2022 Submission dates and Fee

Check the website !!!
Questions?
Scholarly project requirements

Research and Topic
• Trainees may select a SP based on their own interest in an area relevant to psychiatry or mental health.
• The SP must be based on original (novel) research (i.e. trainees do the work and not plagiarised).

Supervision
• The SP supervisor must be a College-accredited supervisor.
• Trainees may choose an additional co-supervisor who is not required to be a College-accredited supervisor (e.g. relevant to the topic).
Authorship

• The trainee must be a major author of the SP who should make substantial contribution in the following areas:
  – Project design
  – Data collection
  – Analysis and interpretation of data
  – Writing of the manuscript

Co-authorship

• Two trainees may co-author a shared SP but they equally contribute to the work and they get one outcome - fail together or pass together.
Scholarly Project type options

**Project Options**

- Quality assurance project or clinical audit (these are not the same thing)
- Systematic and critical literature review
- Original, empirical research (qualitative or quantitative)
- Case series (with a relevant appropriate literature review)
- an equivalent other project as approved by the Scholarly Project Subcommittee (SPSC).

**Standard**

- The SP will be assessed at the standard of a junior consultant regardless of when it is submitted.
“an equivalent other project as approved by the Scholarly Project Subcommittee (SPSC)” - what does this mean?

Say you want to write an essay on the philosophy of capacity in relation to mental health under the supervision of a academically appropriate supervisor.

Approach your DOT then via them the BTC and SPSC.

• The model of assessment is the scientific model so …
• This is a problem if you argue on the side of a position like in a legal case or even a historical case. You must be appropriately critical of your reference material.
• Just because the WHO says so is not justification, - say why it is problematic or how it is derived or what the quality of the evidence is..
• E.g.: If you have an approved project on cultural expression of mourning in Nordic sagas.
• The translation of Nordic words related to mourning as cultural metaphor might mean sad or lost so that has different relevance and you have to critique it as it might culturally mean the same thing to Vikings and be a Jungian equivalent metaphor. But discuss and critique it..
• Linguistics of stigma in Australian newspapers for the gay marriage debate and focus group on the mental health impact on older LGBTQI people/Muslim/gun owners.
• Change in speech after the implementation of recovery oriented language/aboriginal language training/module in community mental health.
• Recording of MH/DH stigma related language ED and possible impacts on delivery of care – literature review.
• Review of the 1960 Royal Commission into Asylums – major issues and outcomes – 60 yrs later (but critical review of content and sources).
• Caffeine dependence in psychiatrists - a qualitative and risk benefit review.
Getting started on the scholarly project

**Step 1 – Deciding on the SP topic**
- Trainees are encouraged to select a SP topic based on their own interest in an area of psychiatry or mental health.
- There may be research opportunities within certain training rotations.
- Consider research requirement for Certificate of Advance Training when choosing SP. May be able to use the same project for both (however this is not guaranteed).

**Step 2 – Selecting a Supervisor**
- The supervisor is required to be a college-accredited supervisor.
- In addition trainees may choose a co-supervisor who is not required to be a college-accredited supervisor.
- The supervisor will guide the trainee, help with the development of the SP, advise on timelines for completing the SP and provide advice on the conduct of the research and writing.
Step 3 – Authorship

- The trainee must be a major author who has made a substantial contribution in project design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of data and writing of the project manuscript.
- And the supervisor signs to say this is true.
Process for trainees suggested in the P&Ps

Stage 1

- Talk it over with everyone, choose a topic, discuss it in supervision, do a bit of research on the topic, does it interest you, is it feasible, is it big enough or small enough? Want to do it with someone else?

Next

- Read the P&P. Put together the application form for BTC approval or decide on an exemption pathway.
- Start work.

Work

- See supervisor regularly. Work steadily on the project. Proof read the project submission and suggest the supervisor proof read the SP. Confirm the SP fulfils criteria.
- Then submit SP.
• The BTC may conditionally approve a Proposal subject to ethics committee approval. This has to be managed locally and the final approved Proposal needs to be sent to the College by the BTC after ethics approval is fully granted.
• The Proposal should be detailed enough to clearly fulfil the requirements of a Scholarly Project.
• Trainees and supervisors to familiarise themselves with the ethics requirement protocols. Some useful online resources/modules can be found in the following link: https://www.nhmrc.gov.au.

SP Proposal form
The Scholarly Proposal form can be found in “Forms and documents” at the bottom of the Scholarly Project page.
https://www.ranzcp.org/pre-fellowship/assessments-college-administered/scholarly-project
Application to Branch Training Committee

- Read the P&P
- Complete the application forms and process e.g.: a supervisor identified and the basic SP outlined in the proposal to BTC

Next

- Apply to the BTC -- if not approved - change the SP or modify proposal

Work

- Commence the project
Submitting a Scholarly Project to the College for assessment

When the project is completed it is assessed by the Committee for Examinations via the Scholarly Project Subcommittee.

Read the submission requirements in the P&P and submit all required evidence.

Outcomes - achieved, did not achieve or conditional pass.
Co-authoring a Scholarly Project

- Trainees can co-author on a single SP.
- Each trainee will have to get their proposal form approved by their BTC.
- Trainees who have co-authored a Scholarly Project must submit only one copy of the project with one submission form listing the details of each co-author. Each trainee must pay the Scholarly Project fee in full; therefore, each co-author must include their own payment details as well as an electronic copy of their current medical registration with the submission.
- Trainees co-authoring a project will receive one result for their Scholarly Project.
- Co-authors must specify in detail their contribution to each component of the project.
Role of the supervisor

- The principal supervisor has to be a college accredited supervisor (preferably having some recognized expertise in research).
- An additional project supervisor may be arranged to provide the expertise in the area of study.
- Engage supervisor with the early discussions and processes.
- Supervisors have a significant role in meeting regularly with the trainee, providing guidance and advice in all aspects from literature review to design to write up.
- Supervisors are required to confirm the research is the trainee’s own work when it is submitted.
Summary

- The Scholarly Project is a mandatory component of the 2012 CBFP training programme.
- It is integrated into the achievement of relevant competencies and skills regarded as essential for Fellowship.
- The process has several steps and it is suggested that it requires ongoing attention throughout the training programme.
- The Policy and Procedures documents are important and are recommended to supervisors and trainees.
HAVE A QUICK BREAK AND ASK QUESTIONS
Applying for an exemption from the Scholarly Project
Scholarly Project exemptions

Trainees may apply for exemption from SP component.

Trainees may be **exempted** from submitting a SP in the following instances:

- Successfully completed a Doctoral thesis, Masters thesis or Honours in a field relevant to psychiatry or mental health in the past 10 years
- Had an article related to psychiatry published in a peer reviewed journal in the last 10 years in which they were a major author (single case(s) published are not regarded as equivalent to a SP)
- An equivalent other project.
Exemption applications should be detailed and contain detailed description of the trainee’s contribution (when not the sole author).

It is a requirement that the trainee provide a letter from the first author to formally validate trainee’s contribution to the research as well as all components of the research and to the publication.

Trainees cannot apply for exemption for a project that has a BTC approved proposal. Trainee must withdraw the proposal before applying for exemption.

Refer to the P&P for further details.
Option 1

- Candidates can seek exemption based on their completed FEC Masters thesis.
- The Scholarly Project Subcommittee will review and grant exemption on a case by case basis.
- The assessment processes are independent and achieving a Masters does not guarantee exemption.
Option 2

- Trainees may use their Scholarly Project as a FEC/Masters project.
- In this case BTC approval is required before the project can be submitted for assessment.
Exemption criteria

- Why have exemptions not been approved?
  - Research not relevant (enough) to psychiatry or mental health
  - Not of an equivalent standard - includes single case and when not used the scientific model required in the assessment model
  - Published in a journal not of adequate standing - “peer reviewed”
  - Publication or qualification greater than 10 years before the application… 84% were exempted in 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Study</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Prior Study and Publication</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Comparable Project</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exemption

- Exemption applications should be detailed and contain *detailed* description of the trainee’s contribution (when not the sole author).
- The co-author/first author/project supervisor is to also provide a supporting letter to formally validate trainee’s contribution to the publications.
• Read the P&P.
• Know what you have to do…
• Word count, cover page, de-identification, referencing, hypotheses..
Assessment Domains

Markers will consider each project according to the domains below. The domains are the same for all forms of Scholarly Project.

• The project is pertinent to the theory or practice of psychiatry and/or mental health

• The presentation and content are clear and concise.
  – Professional English is used with appropriate spelling and grammar
  – The project is 3000 to 5000 words
  – Evidence of Ethics approval is provided where relevant
  – The content conforms to the requirements for the type of project submitted

• There is a clear statement of the objectives of the project.
  – Hypotheses are well formulated and appropriate to the methodology.

• The literature review is comprehensive, contemporary and critical.
• All references cited in the text are listed in an accepted reference style, e.g. Vancouver style.

• The project uses methodology (and analysis) suitable to its format.

• Relevant results are presented appropriately.
  – The discussion provides a concise summary of the main findings.
  – The discussion should include a critical review of the methodology and methods used.
  – The discussion should include a statement about how the project contributes to the field.

• Conclusions relate to the research question and are supported by the project results.
• So don’t think you can get away with it because we have so many to read.
• We read it all, we think about it, we check references, we check stats, we ask if we don’t know and we spend hours giving feedback.
• Follow the guidelines – don’t get hung up on small things like layout and font etc.
Assessment of scholarly Project

- Look at the assessment framework form on the website.
  - Clinical relevance
  - Presentation and content
  - Objectives and/or hypotheses
  - Literature review
  - References
  - Methodology
  - Results
  - Discussion
  - Conclusion
• There is a clear statement of the objectives of the project.

• The literature review is comprehensive, contemporary and critical.

• All references cited in the text are listed in an accepted reference style, e.g. Vancouver style.

• The project uses methodology (and analysis) suitable to its format.

• Relevant results are presented appropriately.

• The discussion provides a concise summary of the main findings.

• Conclusions relate to the project and are supported by the study results.
Project de-identification

- All information which could potentially identify a patient or locality of patient services must be removed from the Scholarly Project, including from all appendices and acknowledgements.
- The trainee’s name is not to appear anywhere on the Scholarly Project. The trainee’s name must only be recorded on the Submission Form and submission files.
- Trainees must acknowledge any assistance provided by the supervisor/co-supervisor or any third party in a signed statement attached to the submission form.
Assessment

Length

• 3000 to 5000 words
• Proof read by supervisor and/or third party as well as by the trainee
• The word count will exclude any de-identification disclaimer, index/table of contents and references/bibliography. Figures and diagrams are also excluded from the word count.

Presentation

• Well presented with a clear layout
• The font must be 12 point in size and should be used consistently throughout the report
• The report must be double spaced and pages must be numbered.
Assessment Marking

Projects will be:

- Outright pass
- Conditional Pass (passed subject to *minor* revisions)
- Fail

- The Scholarly Project Subcommittee members and markers will be marking the Scholarly Projects
- All failed SPs will be given written feedback indicating which domains were not met and why
- All resubmitted projects will be marked by the original marker
- The third submissions of a project will be marked by the SP Co-Chairs.

The Scholarly Project Assessment Framework form is located in the “Forms and documents” section at the bottom of the Scholarly Project page

[https://www.ranzcp.org/pre-fellowship/assessments-college-administered/scholarly-project](https://www.ranzcp.org/pre-fellowship/assessments-college-administered/scholarly-project)
• Conditional pass: - In the event that a project is awarded a conditional pass (i.e. passed subject to revisions), the trainee will receive written feedback indicating what matters need to be addressed. Trainees must revise their manuscript and submit it to the Scholarly Project Subcommittee, with a covering letter outlining how the matters have been addressed, for consideration within the timeframe specified. Trainees should highlight the revised text/sections of their manuscript (do not use Track Changes).

• If the Subcommittee does not believe that the revisions addressed the feedback provided, the trainee is informed that the project has failed.
Fail: - In the event that a project is failed by the first marker, the Chair of the Scholarly Project Subcommittee will arrange for a second independent marker who will be unaware of the initial failure of the project. If the second marker awards a pass or a conditional pass, the Chair will also mark the project and have the deciding vote. If the second marker also fails the project then the trainee is informed that the project has failed.

Trainees will receive written feedback indicating which domains were not met. Written feedback will indicate general areas requiring revision but are not the only thing that needs to be reviewed. The SPs are always marked as a whole.
Resubmitting a failed Scholarly Project

• Trainees may revise their project to address the feedback provided and resubmit to the Scholarly Project Subcommittee or submit an entirely new Scholarly Project. In some instances, examiners may advise trainees that the failed project is unsuitable for resubmission.

• Trainees are reminded that feedback is a guide. On resubmission, a Scholarly Project will be marked as a whole.

• When trainees resubmit a project all previous submissions are sent to the original examiner. The projects are identified by the College as ‘First submission’, ‘Second submission’ and all previous feedback is included. The accompanying Submission Form does not need to be signed by the trainee’s Scholarly Project supervisor (second or third submission).
• If a trainee elects to submit a new project, it is marked as a first submission. A new Submission Form (complete with Scholarly Project supervisor’s signature) is required.

• Trainees who fail the Scholarly Project twice must complete a **targeted learning plan** as per the Policies and Procedures on Targeted Learning Plans and Progression through Training. If you fail 3x – Show Cause processes come into play.

• Trainees must adhere to the overarching requirements of the Policy on Progression through Training and the Policy and Procedure on Failure to Progress.
HAVE FUN.
TIPS

• Read the P&P
• Think about it soon
• Discuss it and read some resources.
• Don’t forget there are options…
• Australasian Psychiatry Feb 2015
  – Series of articles about research and SP
• Resources and research links on the College website
  • E-Leaning Module
  • Scholarly Project Examples
ACTUALLY A VERY EXCITING ASSESSMENT
We very much appreciate if you can provide your feedback on this presentation by clicking on the link below

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/RMHRZPX
THANK YOU