

Education Training Policy

Scholarly Project



Authorising Committee/ Department:	RANZCP Board
Responsible Committee/ Department:	Education Committee
Document Code:	POL EDT-TRN Scholarly Project Policy (13.1)

Targeted learning and training review deadlines effective 1 January 2017

This policy has been updated to include the revised targeted learning and training review deadlines as detailed in the Progression through Training Policy (6.1) and the Trainee Progress Trajectory.

As a result of concerns from trainees, supervisors and Directors of Training, the Board has approved a more accommodating Trainee Progress Trajectory by adjusting the specified targeted learning and training review deadlines associated with each of the five centrally administered assessments.

The previous targeted learning and training review deadlines have been removed from this document. These changes are effective from 1 January 2017.

Further assistance available

Contact the Training team at training@ranzcp.org.

Contents

1. Policy on the Scholarly Project

This policy sets out the requirements of the Scholarly Project, which trainees must successfully complete in order to be eligible for Fellowship.

2. Policy Statement

The successful completion of a College-approved Scholarly Project is a requirement of the RANZCP 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 (mapped to Stage 3).

3. Purpose

This policy sets out the requirements of the Scholarly Project and the expectations for its satisfactory completion as a mandatory component of training under the RANZCP Fellowship Regulations 2012. This policy ensures transparency in the expectation and assessment of the Scholarly Project.

4. Policy Details

4.1 Requirements of the Scholarly Project

4.1.1 Standard

The Scholarly Project can be submitted for assessment during any Stage of training; however, the Project will be assessed at the standard expected at the end of stage 3 regardless of when it is submitted.

Trainees must pass the Scholarly Project assessment to be eligible for Fellowship. (See Policy 6.1 – Progression through the Stages of Training for more information on submission deadlines.)

4.1.2 Research and Topic

Trainees may select their own Scholarly Project topic based on their own interests in an area relevant to psychiatry.

The Scholarly Project must be based on original work (see Scholarly Project Procedure point 1.1.1).

The Scholarly Project may be used to satisfy the research requirements of a Certificate of Advanced Training where applicable.

4.1.3 Learning Goals

The Scholarly Project must address the learning goals detailed below:

- a) conduct a critical appraisal of the literature base in an area of knowledge pertaining to psychiatry or mental health in a broad sense
- b) formulate a scholarly question(s) or hypothesis(es) based on point 'a'
- c) complete a project to address the question(s) or test the hypothesis(es) described in point 'b' above
- d) present the results of point 'c' and discuss in regards to point 'a', including a critical review of project methodology.

Further information on the assessment is described in point 4.5.

4.1.4 Project Options

A Scholarly Project may take the form of:

- o a quality assurance project or clinical audit
- o a systematic and critical literature review
- o original empirical research (qualitative or quantitative)
- o a case series
- o an equivalent other project as approved by the Scholarly Project Subcommittee.

4.1.5 Length

The Scholarly Project must be 3000–5000 words in length.

Exceptions to the length requirement will be made for trainees proceeding to a higher degree (PhD or Masters) who are submitting the literature review leading to a description of testable hypotheses and the methodology intended to test these. Clear evidence of the trainee's intention to proceed to the higher degree must be provided. (See Scholarly Project Procedure point 7.4).

4.2 Supervision

The Scholarly Project supervisor must be involved in considering the most appropriate form for the project.

The principal supervisor/co-supervisor must have appropriate expertise in the area of study

4.2.1 Scholarly Project Supervisor/Clinical Supervisor

A clinical (rotation) supervisor may supervise a trainee's Scholarly Project but it is expected that many trainees will need to locate a separate (Scholarly Project) supervisor with an interest in the project topic and research in general.

4.2.2 Co-supervision

The (principal) Scholarly Project supervisor is required to be a College-accredited supervisor to ensure familiarity with the requirements and deadlines of the training program.

Trainees may seek an additional project co-supervisor (who is not required to be a College-accredited supervisor) for specific expertise in the area of study.

- The co-supervisor may, where appropriate, be a trainee with expertise in the area of study

Trainees should discuss and be approved for exceptions to seeking a local principal supervisor with their Branch Training Committee (BTC).

4.2.3 Group Supervision

In some instances, group supervision may be possible and desirable.

4.3 Authorship

The trainee must be a major author of the Scholarly Project with any assistance provided by their supervisor/co-supervisor or any third party acknowledged formally as specified in the Scholarly Project Procedure.

A major author is defined as an author who has made a substantial contribution to each of the following areas:

- project design
- data collection
- analysis and interpretation of data
- writing of the manuscript.

The Scholarly Project principal supervisor and co-supervisor (where relevant) must confirm that the trainee is a major author of the project by signing the supervisor declaration on the Submission Form.

4.3.1 Co-authorship and Co-research

Trainees may collaborate on a shared Scholarly Project per the requirements specified in the Scholarly Project Procedure. Collaboration may involve people from other disciplines. Trainees who co-author a shared Scholarly project will be awarded the same result.

4.3.2 Adherence to Ethical Requirements

Trainees must adhere to their local research ethics requirements. Where relevant, trainees should provide evidence of local ethics committee approval to satisfy the assessment domains (see point 4.5.1).

4.4 Project Proposal

Trainees must submit their Scholarly Project proposal to their BTC for approval. The BTC or delegated review body will review the scope of the Project to ensure that it adheres to the Scholarly Project Regulation, Policy and Procedure.

The proposal must include information on the aim of the proposed Scholarly Project as well as the Scholarly Project supervisor's name and credentials. Further detail can be found in the Scholarly Project Procedure.

Trainees must be actively training or on an approved break in training in order to be eligible to submit their Scholarly Project proposal. Trainees who have interrupted their training without approval for a break in training are considered to be not in training as per the Leave and Interruptions to Training Policy (23.1), and are not eligible to complete or submit their Scholarly Project proposal during that time.

Trainees may not (later) apply for exemption for a project that has a BTC-approved proposal.

4.5 Submission and Assessment of the Scholarly Project

Trainees must submit their Project for assessment to the Scholarly Project Subcommittee (via the Examinations Department at the College head office), which will delegate the marking of individual projects to suitably experienced Fellows.

Fellows cannot adjudicate a project where they have a conflict of interest.

Scholarly Projects that are submitted without the required forms will be returned to the trainee unmarked, as outlined in the Procedure.

Trainees must be actively training or on an approved break in training in order to be eligible to submit their Scholarly Project. Trainees who have interrupted their training without approval for a break in training are considered to be not in training as per the Leave and Interruptions to Training Policy (23.1), and are not eligible to complete or submit their Scholarly Project during that time.

Trainees who are applying for special consideration should follow the overarching requirements of the Special Considerations Policy (18.1.).

Trainees must refer to the Scholarly Project Procedure and the Targeted Learning Policy and Procedure (6.2) for information about submissions related to targeted learning.

4.5.1 Assessment Domains

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

- a) The project is pertinent to the theory or practice of psychiatry.
- b) The presentation and content are clear and concise.
 - o Professional English is used with appropriate spelling and grammar. (Trainees should have their project proofread.)
 - o The project is 3000–5000 words.
 - o Evidence of local ethics committee approval is provided where relevant.
 - o The content conforms to the requirements for the type of project submitted per the Scholarly Project Procedure.
- c) There is a clear statement of the objectives of the project.
 - o Hypotheses are well formulated and appropriate to the methodology.
- d) The literature review is comprehensive, contemporary and critical.
- e) All references cited in the text are listed at the end of the report in an accepted reference style that uses superscript numbers in the body of the case, e.g. Vancouver style. (This is to ensure the word count can be verified).
- f) The project uses methodology (and analysis) suitable to its format.
- g) Relevant results are presented appropriately.

- h) The discussion provides a concise summary of the main findings including a:
 - o critical review of the methodology and methods used
 - o statement about how the project contributes to the field.
- i) Conclusions relate to the research question and are supported by the project results.

4.6 Recognition of Prior Learning

Trainees who have completed a project that they believe to be equivalent may apply for recognition of prior learning (RPL) in relation to the Scholarly Project no more than 6 months after the date on which they commence training in the RANZCP Fellowship Program (i.e. the day they start accruing accredited training time or start a break in training), in accordance with the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy (14.1). As stated in that policy, RPL may be granted where it is confirmed that there is equivalency.

4.7 Exemption

In addition to the possibility of exemption through the RPL process (see point 4.6) there is an additional avenue for exemption from the Scholarly Project requirement that can be accessed during training.

Trainees may be exempt from undertaking a Scholarly Project if they have completed a doctoral thesis, Masters thesis or Honours thesis in a field relevant to psychiatry or mental health, or if they have had an article of which they were a major author (see definition in point 4.3) accepted for publication in a recognised peer-reviewed English-language journal relevant to psychiatry or mental health within the past 10 years.

Exemption may be granted where the trainee has demonstrated competency with a substantially comparable project.

Trainees may not (later) apply for exemption for a project that has a BTC-approved proposal.

Further detail can be found in the Scholarly Project Procedure (point 15).

4.8 Deadline

The deadline for successfully completing the Scholarly Project is detailed in the Policy on Progression through Training (6.1). A brief reference to the requirements of the Policy on Progression through Training (6.1) and the Policy and Procedure on Failure to Progress (19.1) follow; however, trainees are responsible for knowing the requirements of these and other policies in full.

The Scholarly Project is expected to be attempted and passed by the time the trainee has completed 60 months' full-time equivalent (FTE) accredited training.

- Failure to do so will result in a requirement for the trainee to complete a targeted learning plan and may lead to a requirement for the trainee in submitting an application to the Committee for Training (CFT) for a training review as to why they should be able to continue towards Fellowship. Further detail, including information on exceptional cases, can be found in the Policy and Procedure on Failure to Progress (19.1).

Should a trainee fail the Scholarly Project assessment twice, the trainee must complete a targeted learning plan as per the Policies and Procedures on Targeted Learning Plans (6.2) and Progression through Training (6.1).

Should a trainee fail the Scholarly Project assessment three times, the trainee must submit a training review application to the CFT as to why they should be able to continue towards Fellowship as per the Policy and Procedure on Failure to Progress (19.1).

4.9 Reviews of Decisions

Any request by trainees for review of a decision in relation to the Scholarly Project or an application for exemption should follow the formal education review process.

5. Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

The Education Committee (EC) shall implement, monitor and review this policy and report on anomalies and issues as these arise.

This policy will be reviewed biennially and updated as required.

6. Associated Documents

6.1 Regulation: 13.1 Scholarly Project Education Training Regulation

6.2 Policy:

- 6.1 Progression through Training Education Training Policy
- 19.1 Failure to Progress Education Training Policy and Procedure
- 6.2 Targeted Learning Plans Education Training Policy and Procedure
- 14.1 Recognition of Prior Learning Education Training Policy and Procedure
- 18.2 Special Consideration Education Training Policy
- 2.1 Reviews and Appeals Education Training Policy

6.3 Procedure: 13.1 Scholarly Project Education Training Procedure

6.4 Forms :

- Scholarly Project Proposal Forms
- Scholarly Project Submission Form
- Scholarly Project Assessment Framework
- Application for Exemption Form

6.5 Other: [‘Research in psychiatry’](#) page of the College website

REVISION RECORD

Contact:		Project Officer, Education and Training	
Date	Version	Approver	Description
18/08/12	v.1.9	General Council	Approved by General Council (R30, 18 August 2012)
18/11/12	v.1.10	General Council	Minor edits made as recommended by the Scholarly Project Subcommittee and inclusion of reference to Progression through Training/Failure to Progress Policies. Approved by Scholarly Project Subcommittee 26/09/12. Approved by GC (R58).

25/05/13	v.2.0	General Council	Edits clarifying submission made by Scholarly Project Subcommittee, noted by CFE, approved by BOE 10/5/13, Approved by General Council (R29).
27/10/13	v.3.0	RANZCP Board	Edits stating that projects must have been completed in the last 10 years in order to be eligible for exemption (point 4.7) & minor clarifications. Approved by Scholarly Project Subcommittee 12/9/13, reviewed by CFE 3/10/13, approved by EC 17/10/13, approved by CGRC 18/10/13, approved by RANZCP Board B2013/6 R11.
21/05/14	v.3.1	N/A	Minor additions to clarify that submissions and contact re: the Scholarly Project should be made to the Examinations Department.
22/07/14	v.3.2	N/A	Minor edits clarifying when an RPL application is due. Approved by CFE 25/06/14. Corrected 'supervising Fellow' to a 'College-accredited supervisor', noted by CFE Chair. Approved by EC 8/8/14.
18/03/15	v.3.3	N/A	Minor alignments to rules approved in Leave & Interruptions to Training Policy (Board approved 14/2/15). The Scholarly Project (& Research & Proposal) can be submitted while a trainee is on an approved break in training but not if they are 'not in training' (i.e. not actively training nor on an approved break in training).
02/06/16	v.3.4.5	RANZCP Board	Revised to reflect targeted learning/targeted learning plan (formally remediation/remediation plan) and standard expected at end of stage 3 (formally junior consultant standard) terminology changes. Approved EC 29/04/2016. Reviewed CGRC 28/04/2016. Approved Board B2016/4. Revised to reflect updates to the targeted learning and show cause points for the five centrally administered assessments, effective from 1/1/2017. Approved EC 03/06/2016. Reviewed CGRC 17/06/2016. Approved Board B2016/5. Edits recommended by the Scholarly Project Subcommittee to clarify that trainees who co-author a shared project will be awarded same result and that trainees may not apply for exemption for projects that have BTC-approved proposals. Approved CFE 06/07/16. Approved EC 22/07/16. Reviewed CGRC 21/07/16. Approved Board out of session 25/08/2016.
01/09/17	v.3.5	N/A	Alignment with Targeted Learning Policy & Procedure updates that were approved by RANZCP Board 13/08/17 B2017/5 R16.
11/03/2020	v.3.6	Committee for Training	Change of terminology from 'Show Cause' to 'Training Review'. (CFT approved, 12/12/2019).

August 2021

NEXT REVIEW