

**The Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
Shortlisting Framework 2012 – Guidance for applicants**

This document contains full scoring frameworks for ST1-4.

All candidates must be assessed against the criteria for the level to which they applied.

In order to assess suitability for interview candidates must be assessed in the following three stages

- **Stage One (Longlisting):** To be completed by Deanery staff to confirm that eligibility requirements have been met
- **Stage Two (Shortlisting):** To be completed by Deanery and Clinical staff as appropriate ensuring that the candidate has the essential attributes outlined in the person specification e.g. relevant training qualifications.
- **Stage Three (Shortlisting):** To be completed by clinical shortlisting panel using this framework

Please note: All members of shortlisting and interview panels must have received appropriate training in Assessment, Selection, Equality and Diversity. All applications will be scored by a minimum of two assessors. The average of these scores will be used to reach the final score.

Each level of training carries a maximum score in accordance with the requirements of that level as detailed below

ST1 = 34
ST2 = 48
ST3 = 46
ST4 = 47

The college does not stipulate a minimum score an application must reach before progressing to interview, however all essential criteria must be met at the closing date of application.

Important: Applicants can only be considered for the level of training to which they applied even if they appear suitable for another level. Under no circumstances should an application be considered at another level.

Scoring Frameworks

Once eligibility has been determined, candidates are to be assessed using the following frameworks:

ST1		
Area of assessment	Indicators	Score
Additional Qualifications	➤ No additional qualifications	0
	➤ Postgraduate diploma/ Postgraduate certificate/Intercalated degree (2.1 or 2.2)	1
	➤ Intercalated degree (1st class honours)	2
	➤ MSc Med or equivalent	3
	➤ PhD or MD by research	4
Clinical experience linking to career in paediatrics relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No evidence	0
	➤ Examples with little relevance to the specialty and/or little attempt to explain relevance of skills	1
	➤ Examples limited in scope and/or somewhat vague/unspecific with limited/superficial attempt to link examples to specialty	2
	➤ One significant and specific example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained (e.g. content or transferable skills)	3
	➤ More than one specific and significant example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained	4
Audit relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No audit undertaken	0
	➤ Participation in relevant clinical audit (but did not design or lead audit)	1
	➤ Evidence of having designed, led and presented a good quality audit	2
	➤ Evidence of having presented a good quality audit at a local meeting and participated in regular useful audits throughout training	3
	➤ Has completed a good quality full audit cycle and presented its findings and has a good record of significant regular audit involvement in training	4
Management relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of management	0
	➤ Involvement in rota organisation, coordinating shifts/guideline development	1
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor in local organisations within university, medical school or department	2
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor at higher level within university, medical school or regional NHS	3
	➤ Lead role nationally at undergraduate or postgraduate level	4
Academic achievements relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No research or poor description of research	0
	➤ Good description of involvement in a research project	1
	➤ Good description of a research project meeting with a regional presentation	2
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: National presentation or publication as co-author	3
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: Publication as first or last author or international presentation	4
Teaching relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of delivered teaching	0
	➤ Very limited participation in some local teaching	1
	➤ Contributed to local teaching (but did not lead)	2
	➤ Designed and led local teaching	3
	➤ Designed and led regional teaching	4
	➤ Extensive teaching experience including formal training in teaching methodology	5
Statement to support	➤ No statement or nothing of substance	0
	➤ Weak statement unclear motivation	1

application relevant to level of application and experience of applicant	➤ Some motivating factors but appears general and unfocused	2
	➤ More focused motivation described using some specific examples	3
	➤ Good clearly described focused motivating factors and experiences relating to career	4
	➤ Excellent clear description of motivation and experience which clearly shows commitment to the specialty	5
Overall excellence of application	➤ Weak, poorly presented & organised application with little to recommend	0
	➤ Some areas poorly presented and not organised	1
	➤ Overall presentation & organisation satisfactory, worthy of consideration	2
	➤ Good overall application with answers showing strength and breadth	3
	➤ Excellent application well organised and presented with candidate clearly demonstrating considerable ability and achievement	4
Total		34

ST2		
Area of assessment	Indicators	Score
Additional Qualifications	➤ No additional qualifications	0
	➤ Postgraduate diploma/ Postgraduate certificate/Intercalated degree (2.1 or 2.2)	1
	➤ Intercalated degree (1st class honours)	2
	➤ MSc Med or equivalent	3
	➤ PhD or MD by research	4
MRCPCH	➤ No parts passed	0
	➤ Passed Part 1a	1
	➤ Passed Parts 1a and 1b	2
Career Progression relating to stage of application	➤ Poor progress	0
	➤ Below average progress	1
	➤ Average progress	2
	➤ Good progress	3
	➤ Excellent progress	4
<p><i>*Note that there must be 12 months of recognised training in paediatrics to be eligible for ST2. Applicants with training or experience in paediatrics of more than 24 months w.t.e would have to demonstrate that this has provided additional competences relevant to this stage of application. Prolonged training and experience in paediatrics (e.g. 3 years or more) would score no marks unless it was justified because such an applicant might be expected to apply at a higher level. (in all cases, months refer to whole time equivalent)</i></p>		
FTSTA or equivalent	➤ FTSTA post with no evidence of Work Place Based Assessments	0
	➤ 12 months training in FTSTA or equivalent post with Work Place Based Assessments (which has/will be assessed at an ARCP)	4
Clinical experience linking to career in	➤ No evidence	0
	➤ Examples with little relevance to the specialty and/or little attempt to explain relevance of skills	1
	➤ Examples limited in scope and/or somewhat	2

paediatrics relevant to application level and experience of applicant	vague/unspecific with limited/superficial attempt to link examples to specialty	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ One significant and specific example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained (e.g. content or transferable skills) ➤ More than one specific and significant example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained 	3 4
Courses	➤ None	0
	➤ One of (APLS/EPLS/PLS), NLS or Child Protection	1
	➤ Two of (APLS/EPLS/PLS), NLS or Child Protection	2
	➤ All three of (APLS/EPLS/PLS), NLS or Child Protection	3
	➤ Nominated for instructor of (APLS/EPLS/PLS) or NLS	4
<i>*Note APLS/EPLS and PLS only score one mark</i>		
Audit relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No audit undertaken	0
	➤ Participation in relevant clinical audit (but did not design or lead audit)	1
	➤ Evidence of having designed, led and presented a good quality audit	2
	➤ Evidence of having presented a good quality audit at a local meeting and participated in regular useful audits throughout training	3
	➤ Has completed a good quality full audit cycle and presented its findings and has a good record of significant regular audit involvement in training	4
Management relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of management	0
	➤ Involvement in rota organisation, coordinating shifts/guideline development	1
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor in local organisations within university, medical school or department	2
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor at higher level within university, medical school or regional NHS	3
	➤ Lead role nationally at undergraduate or postgraduate level	4
Academic achievements relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No research or poor description of research	0
	➤ Good description of involvement in a research project	1
	➤ Good description of a research project meeting with a regional presentation	2
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: National presentation or publication as co-author	3
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: Publication as first or last author or international presentation	4
Teaching relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of delivered teaching	0
	➤ Very limited participation in some local teaching	1
	➤ Contributed to local teaching (but did not lead)	2
	➤ Designed and led local teaching	3
	➤ Designed and led regional teaching	4
➤ Extensive teaching experience including formal training in teaching methodology	5	
Statement to support application relevant to level of application and	➤ No statement or nothing of substance	0
	➤ Weak statement unclear motivation	1
	➤ Some motivating factors but appears general and unfocussed	2
	➤ More focused motivation described using some specific examples	3
	➤ Good clearly described focused motivating factors and	4

experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ experiences relating to career so far ➤ Excellent clear description of motivation and experience which clearly shows commitment to the specialty 	5
Overall excellence of application	➤ Weak, poorly presented & organised application with little to recommend	0
	➤ Some areas poorly presented and not organised	1
	➤ Overall presentation & organisation satisfactory, worthy of consideration	2
	➤ Good overall application with answers showing strength and breadth	3
	➤ Excellent application well organised and presented with candidate clearly demonstrating considerable ability and achievement	4
Total		48

ST3		
Area of assessment	Indicators	Score
Additional Qualifications	➤ No additional qualifications	0
	➤ Postgraduate diploma/ Postgraduate certificate/Intercalated degree (2.1 or 2.2)	1
	➤ Intercalated degree (1st class honours)	2
	➤ MSc Med or equivalent	3
	➤ PhD or MD by research	4
MRCPCH	➤ Passed Parts 1a and 1b	Essential
	➤ Passed Part 2 Written	3
	➤ Passed MRCPCH	4
Career Progression relating to stage of application	➤ Poor progress	0
	➤ Below average progress	1
	➤ Average progress	2
	➤ Good progress	3
	➤ Excellent progress	4
	<p><i>*Note that there should usually be 24-30 months (minimum 12 months) of recognised training in paediatrics to be eligible for ST3, including a mandatory 6 months regional neonatal experience. Those with less than 24 months would have to make clear in Section G why a ST-3 application was more appropriate than a ST2 application. Those with between 30-48 months training and experience would be expected to justify the reason for application at this level and marks should be allocated accordingly. Prolonged training and experience in paediatrics (e.g. 4 years or more) would score no marks unless it was justified because such an applicant would be expected to apply at ST4.</i></p>	
FTSTA or equivalent	➤ FTSTA post with no evidence of Work Place Based Assessments	0
	➤ 12 months training in FTSTA or equivalent post with Work Place Based Assessments (which has/will be assessed at an ARCP)	4
Clinical experience linking to career in paediatrics relevant to application level and	➤ No evidence	0
	➤ Examples with little relevance to the specialty and/or little attempt to explain relevance of skills	1
	➤ Examples limited in scope and/or somewhat vague/unspecific with limited/superficial attempt to link examples to specialty	2
	➤ One significant and specific example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly	3

experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ explained (e.g. content or transferable skills) ➤ More than one specific and significant example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained 	4
Courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Nominated for instructor of (APLS/EPLS/PLS) or NLS 	1
Audit relevant to application level and experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No audit undertaken ➤ Participation in relevant clinical audit (but did not design or lead audit) ➤ Evidence of having designed, led and presented a good quality audit ➤ Evidence of having presented a good quality audit at a local meeting and participated in regular useful audits throughout training ➤ Has completed a good quality full audit cycle and presented its findings and has a good record of significant regular audit involvement in training 	0 1 2 3 4
Management relevant to application level and experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No experience of management ➤ Involvement in rota organisation, coordinating shifts/guideline development ➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor in local organisations within university, medical school or department ➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor at higher level within university, medical school or regional NHS ➤ Lead role nationally at undergraduate or postgraduate level 	0 1 2 3 4
Academic achievements relevant to application level and experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No research or poor description of research ➤ Good description of involvement in a research project ➤ Good description of a research project meeting with a regional presentation ➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: National presentation or publication as co-author ➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: Publication as first or last author or international presentation 	0 1 2 3 4
Teaching relevant to application level and experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No experience of delivered teaching ➤ Very limited participation in some local teaching ➤ Contributed to local teaching (but did not lead) ➤ Designed and led local teaching ➤ Designed and led regional teaching ➤ Extensive teaching experience including formal training in teaching methodology 	0 1 2 3 4 5
Statement to support application relevant to level of application and experience of applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No statement or nothing of substance ➤ Weak statement unclear motivation ➤ Some motivating factors but appears general and unfocussed ➤ More focused motivation described using some specific examples ➤ Good clearly described focused motivating factors and experiences relating to career so far ➤ Excellent clear description of motivation and experience which clearly shows commitment to the specialty 	0 1 2 3 4 5
Overall excellence of application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Weak, poorly presented & organised application with little to recommend ➤ Some areas poorly presented and not organised ➤ Overall presentation & organisation satisfactory, worthy of consideration 	0 1 2

	➤ Good overall application with answers showing strength and breadth	3
	➤ Excellent application well organised and presented with candidate clearly demonstrating considerable ability and achievement	4
Total		47

ST4		
Area of assessment	Indicators	Score
Additional Qualifications	➤ No additional qualifications	0
	➤ Postgraduate diploma/ Postgraduate certificate/Intercalated degree (2.1 or 2.2)	1
	➤ Intercalated degree (1st class honours)	2
	➤ MSc Med or equivalent	3
	➤ PhD or MD by research	4
MRCPCH	➤ Passed full MRCPCH examination	Essential
Career Progression relating to stage of application	➤ Poor progress	0
	➤ Below average progress	1
	➤ Average progress	2
	➤ Good progress	3
	➤ Excellent progress	4
	<i>*Note that there should usually be 36-48 months (minimum 24 months) of recognised training in paediatrics to be eligible for ST4, including 6 months of regional neonatal experience. Those with less than 36 months would have to make clear why a ST4 application was more appropriate than a ST3 application. Those with more than 4 years training and experience in paediatrics will be expected to justify the reasons for this. Prolonged training and experience in paediatrics (e.g. 7 years or more) would score no marks unless it were clearly justified.</i>	
FTSTA or equivalent	➤ FTSTA post with no evidence of Work Place Based Assessments	0
	➤ 12 months training in FTSTA or equivalent post with Work Place Based Assessments (which has/will be assessed at an ARCP)	4
Subspecialty experience	➤ At least 6 months training in a regional subspecialty department	2
Middle Grade Experience	➤ At least 6 months experience working at middle grade level	2
Clinical experience linking to career in paediatrics relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No evidence	0
	➤ Examples with little relevance to the specialty and/or little attempt to explain relevance of skills	1
	➤ Examples limited in scope and/or somewhat vague/unspecific with limited/superficial attempt to link examples to specialty	2
	➤ One significant and specific example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained (e.g. content or transferable skills)	3
	➤ More than one specific and significant example of skills, with relevance to specialty and own development clearly explained	4
Courses	➤ Nominated for instructor of (APLS/EPLS/PLS) or NLS	1
Audit relevant	➤ No audit undertaken	0

to application level and experience of applicant	➤ Participation in relevant clinical audit (but did not design or lead audit)	1
	➤ Evidence of having designed, led and presented a good quality audit	2
	➤ Evidence of having presented a good quality audit at a local meeting and participated in regular useful audits throughout training	3
	➤ Has completed a good quality full audit cycle and presented its findings and has a good record of significant regular audit involvement in training	4
Management relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of management	0
	➤ Involvement in rota organisation, coordinating shifts/guideline development	1
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor in local organisations within university, medical school or department	2
	➤ Lead role as undergraduate/junior doctor at higher level within university, medical school or regional NHS	3
	➤ Lead role nationally at undergraduate or postgraduate level	4
Academic achievements relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No research or poor description of research	0
	➤ Good description of involvement in a research project	1
	➤ Good description of a research project meeting with a regional presentation	2
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: National presentation or publication as co-author	3
	➤ Good description of research project meeting at least one of: Publication as first or last author or international presentation	4
Teaching relevant to application level and experience of applicant	➤ No experience of delivered teaching	0
	➤ Very limited participation in some local teaching	1
	➤ Contributed to local teaching (but did not lead)	2
	➤ Designed and led local teaching	3
	➤ Designed and led regional teaching	4
	➤ Extensive teaching experience including formal training in teaching methodology	5
Statement to support application relevant to level of application and experience of applicant	➤ No statement or nothing of substance	0
	➤ Weak statement unclear motivation	1
	➤ Some motivating factors but appears general and unfocussed	2
	➤ More focused motivation described using some specific examples	3
	➤ Good clearly described focused motivating factors and experiences relating to career so far	4
	➤ Excellent clear description of motivation and experience which clearly shows commitment to the specialty	5
Overall excellence of application	➤ Weak, poorly presented & organised application with little to recommend	0
	➤ Some areas poorly presented and not organised	1
	➤ Overall presentation & organisation satisfactory, worthy of consideration	2
	➤ Good overall application with answers showing strength and breadth	3
	➤ Excellent application well organised and presented with candidate clearly demonstrating considerable ability and achievement	4
Total		47