

FAMILY MEDICINE CLERKSHIP EVALUATING STUDENTS: An Overview

Updated 5/1/12

Grading Policy and Process

We are a mastery clerkship. We assess students' mastery of the core skills and knowledge of Family Medicine at the end of six week rotation-regardless of where or when the student takes the clerkship.

The site coordinator is in charge of collecting, evaluating, and synthesizing the Feedback and Evaluation form by the faculty into a final evaluation for the student.

The site coordinator should take into account the depth, length of time, and when each faculty interacted with the student as they synthesize the summary evaluation. If controversy about the evaluation exists, the site coordinator resolves the various points of view and comes up with the final evaluation.

Grades are assigned in the Seattle office based on the scores and comments on the final evaluation. The site coordinator should familiarize him or herself with the numeric scoring criteria for final grades: Failure, Pass, High Pass and Honors. Likewise, he or she should use the anchors on the Feedback and Evaluation Form on the faculty tab to assure that the comments align with the scores assigned. Site coordinators are expected to enter a recommended grade when completing the student evaluation form.

Formative Section:

Comments on the formative section of the evaluation form should be detailed and address both strengths and areas for growth. Comments should be relevant to the grading categories and direct quotes from individual evaluations should be carefully chosen and support summary comments.

The anchors on the feedback and evaluation form set the standard for student performance for all rotations. We understand that students in Summer A have, in general, more to learn than students in Spring B. We use our defined criteria and anchors for all rotations to be fair to all. We do not have a way to evaluate over 200 students taking into account the time of the year when each student is taking the clerkship. We make an effort to communicate this policy to the students and encourage them to consider this when scheduling their clerkships.

Evaluator Concern

Site Coordinators have the discretion of placing comments in the Evaluator Concern section to describe a particular incident or to note general concerns.

The purpose of this is to provide feedback to students and to give the school additional information to use in the management and oversight of students' academic and professional development. The Evaluator Concern designation is not recorded on the official transcript. An evaluator concern documenting a serious deficiency or a pattern of

evaluation concerns in two or more courses may result in the student's performance being deemed unsatisfactory for continuance in the medical school program.

Summative Comment section:

The summative section will be used in the MSPE letter or dean's letter. This section should focus almost exclusively on the student's strengths. Similar to the formative section of the evaluation, it is important to be specific and use examples of the student's performance.

In this section it is important to also pay close attention to the language used to describe the student's performance. The MSPE includes a key that describes the code words and the percentage of students that earn each one. At the University of Washington, the code words are good, very good, excellent, and outstanding. Good and very good are roughly equivalent to a pass, excellent approximates a high pass, and outstanding is for an honors performance in the clerkship. While it is not necessary to use these exact words in all your comments, we do ask that you keep these key words in mind when summarizing student performance.