NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AWARDS EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL RUBRIC

Section	Below the standard of excellence	Meets the standard for excellence	Exceptionally above the standard of excellence
Goals (5 points)	Goals are generic Goals are not relevant to creation of educational material or educational scholarship Unachievable or not realistic Unclear or not well-defined	 Learner-focused (e.g., reflect attention to learner needs) Relevant to creation of educational material or scholarship Achievable and realistic Clear Measurable in some cases 	 Highly learner-focused (reflect strong understanding of attention to addressing needs of learners) Achievable and realistic Clear and specific (focused, welldefined, action-oriented) Mostly measurable Innovative
Personal Preparation in the development of educational materials (5 points)	Time spent in preparation activities is not quantifiable Activities included are considered standard job responsibilities or focused on maintaining clinical skills (e.g., reading journal articles) No description of how development activities are related to goals as an educator Activities are not related to improving skills development of educational material Activities are planned for the future, but have not yet been initiated	Time spent in preparation activities well defined and quantified Preparation activities are related to skills required for development of educational material Significant amount of time is spent in preparation activities Well-defined quantifiable experiences are included Personal preparation activities linked to educational materials produced	 Time spent in personal development as a leader is quantifiable and logical Participated in activities consistently over significant periods of time Activities include formal training (e.g. workshop on case report writing, workshops on producing electronic educational material) Relevance of development activities clearly linked to goals and educational materials produced
Self-reflection and	0-3	4	5
improvement (5 points)	No meaningful reflection on feedback received from learners or peers.	 Uses feedback from multiple sources, but may not have explicitly solicited the feedback 	 Evidence is provided regarding explicit use of feedback to make changes in materials

	 Feedback is from a limited number of sources No description of how feedback was used to guide self- improvement or improvement of material 	 Description of self-reflection based on feedback Provides examples of changes in materials based on feedback 	 Explicitly solicits feedback from multiple sources Specific and detailed descriptions of improvements as a result of feedback
Portfolio preparation (5 points)	Portfolio was poorly or sloppily organized or with errors in grammar, syntax or spelling Structured summary and structured abstracts lack one or more major components	Portfolio is mostly organized and searchable Supporting evidence is mostly clear Information was consistent across the structured summary, personal statement, CV and supporting evidence Information present in the structured summary and abstracts resembles standard. The writing is clear and easy to follow	 Portfolio was clearly organized, easy to read and neatly formatted. Description of time and effort with each structured abstract is included and explicit Information is consistent across the structured summary, personal statement, CV and supporting evidence, cross-referenced and highlighted. All required information is present in the structured summary The writing is clear with logical progression of ideas, grammatically correct and may be "artistic."
	0-14	15-18	19-20
Quality: Methods (20 points)	 No description of methods used to prepare material No peer review of materials Description of time/effort with each item is incomplete or confusing 	 Description of methods with each structured abstract Description of time/effort is included with each structured abstract Most materials peer reviewed 	 Methods used are innovative, in addition to being appropriate for the content and environment Time and effort description is included and is substantial All materials are peer reviewed
	0-14	15-18	19-20

NRF EM Scoring Rubric 2

Quality: Meaningful results (20 points)	 Little evidence of impact No/minimal description of learner/peer evaluations of material No dissemination outside BCM 	 Moderate impact of most materials listed Learner/Peer evaluation described for most materials and is positive Dissemination of most of the material is beyond BCM 	 High impact of most materials listed Learner/peer evaluation for all material demonstrating high quality Wide dissemination of all of the materials listed (e.g. Publication, College-Wise dissemination, use outside BCM) Major role in national educational material (e.g. practice guidelines, major textbooks)
Quantity	Small role in preparation of material Less than 6 items	At least 6 materials with structured abstracts with significant role in preparing material for majority of	 30 10 or more items OR > 800 hours total effort
(30 points)	Less than 500 hours of total effort	material OR • 500 hours of effort	
	0-7	8-9	10
Breadth (10 points)	None of the following: Materials designed for more than 1 learner population (med student, graduate student, resident, fellow, faculty, allied health student type, different subspecialty trainees, patients) 1-2 types of material	At least ONE of the following: Materials designed for more than 1 learner population (med student, graduate student, resident, fellow, faculty, allied health student type, different subspecialty trainees, patients) studied types of material	BOTH of the following: Materials designed for more than 1 learner population (med student, graduate student, resident, fellow, faculty, allied health student type, different subspecialty trainees, patients) studied More than 3 types of material

NRF EM Scoring Rubric 3