



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Program Formative Assessments

1. Case based Discussion (CbD)
2. Child Protection Case based Discussion (CbD)
3. Directly Observed Procedural Skills (DOPs)
4. Mini-Clinical Examination (MiniCEX)
5. Discussion of Correspondence Assessment (DOCa)
6. Clinical Supervisor Report
7. Educational Supervisor Report
8. Multi-source Feedback (MsF)



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Case-Based Discussion (CbD)

Date:

Trainee's Name																			
Date of enrolment		D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	Matric Number							
Date of assessment		D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	MMC Number							
Year of study												Posting							
Hospital																			
Clinical Setting:		<input type="checkbox"/> A&E		<input type="checkbox"/> Clinic		<input type="checkbox"/> In-patient		<input type="checkbox"/> Neonates		<input type="checkbox"/> Acute Admission									
Clinical Problem Category:		<input type="checkbox"/> Sepsis		<input type="checkbox"/> CVS		<input type="checkbox"/> Shock		<input type="checkbox"/> Gastro		<input type="checkbox"/> Neuro		<input type="checkbox"/> Airway/Breathing							
		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> Others (Please specify):															
Behaviour/Developmental																			
Write a brief clinical summary of the case here e.g. 5-year-old girl with fever for two months.																			
Complexity of case in relation to stage of training: <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> High																			
Who chose this case?		<input type="checkbox"/> Trainee				<input type="checkbox"/> Assessor													
Focus of clinical encounter:		<input type="checkbox"/> History				<input type="checkbox"/> Diagnosis				<input type="checkbox"/> Management				<input type="checkbox"/> Explanation					
Areas of strength and suggestions for development:																			
Areas to consider for discussion and feedback										Comments									
<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Medical record keeping◆ Clinical Assessment◆ Investigation and referral◆ Management of challenging and complex situations◆ Risk assessments◆ Treatment										Trainer to complete after discussion.									
In relation to THIS CASE, do you have any concerns about this trainee's knowledge base?																			
<input type="checkbox"/> No concern <input type="checkbox"/> Minor concern <input type="checkbox"/> Serious concern																			
Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's knowledge base.																			



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme Case-Based Discussion (CbD)

Is there anything especially good you wish to comment on?

Agreed learning objectives

Please describe what you have learned from this case. How will it change your practice in the future? Trainee to complete

Please grade the area listed below using the given scale (1 -6)

1. On the basis of THIS CASE , how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care for their stage of training	Scale 1. Unsafe 2. Below expectation 3. Meets expectation 4. Above expectation 5. Well above expectation 6. Unable to comment
2. On the basis of THIS CASE , how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care in relation to the standard expected at confirmation of completion of training	

In relation to **THIS CASE**, do you have any concern about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas not highlighted by the questions?

☐ No concern ☐ Minor concern ☐ Serious concern ☐ Unable to judge

Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas. Refer to Educational Supervisor if necessary.

Assessor's Name

MMC Number

Assessor's position: ☐ Consultant ☐ Specialist

Time taken for discussion (in minutes):

Time taken for feedback (in minutes):

Assessor's signature:

Trainee's signature:

[Type here]

National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme Safeguarding Children Case Based Discussion

Date:

[illegible]

Category of abuse involved: ☐ physical ☐ sexual ☐ emotional ☐ neglect ☐ factitious or induced illness

Clinical setting: Safeguarding concerns as part of acute presentation ☐ Child protection medical ☐ MDT meeting ☐

Case conference ☐ Other (specify):

Please insert a brief summary of the case and the reasons why safeguarding concerns were raised:

Trainee to complete in advance at the time of ordering assessment

What was your role in eliciting/managing these concerns? (Observer; responsible for admission; discussing/making referral to children's social care; presenting case in social concerns meeting; interviewed parents; examined child)

Trainee to complete in advance at the time of ordering assessment

Areas for development and agreed learning objectives:

Possible questions for discussion	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ How did the child behave and interact with their parents and other adults? ◆ What are the risks to the child and the protective factors in the child's life? ◆ What were the key elements of the referral to children's social care? ◆ What agencies were involved? What role did they play? Comment on the communication between different agencies. ◆ What other interventions would be useful for this child? ◆ Had there been any missed opportunities to intervene? ◆ What was the outcome? ◆ Did you find any aspects of this case difficult? How did you manage these difficulties? 	

Based on this discussion is the trainee competent for their level of training with regard to child protection work?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have a concern?

☐ No concern ☐ Minor concern ☐ Serious concern

Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's competence and knowledge base.

In relation to **THIS CASE**, do you have any concern about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas not highlighted by the questions?

☐ No concern ☐ Minor concern ☐ Serious concern ☐ Unable to judge

Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas. Refer to Educational Supervisor if necessary.

[Type here]



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Safeguarding Children Case Based Discussion

Please grade the area listed below using the given scale (1 -6)		Scale
1. On the basis of THIS CASE, how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care for their stage of training		1. Unsafe 2. Below expectation 3. Meets expectation 4. Above expectation 5. Well above expectation 6. Unable to comment
2. On the basis of THIS CASE, how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care in relation to the standard expected at confirmation of completion of training		
Is there anything especially good you wish to comment on?		
Suggestions for development		
Agreed action		
Assessor's Name		
MMC Number		
Time taken for discussion (in minutes):	Time taken for feedback (in minutes):	
Assessor's signature	Student's signature	



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Directly Observed Procedural Skills

Date:

Trainee's Name:																					
Date of enrolment											Matric Number										
Date of assessment											MMC number										
Year of study											Posting										
Hospital																					
Procedure																					

Domain & Comments	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Comments
Knowledge (indication, anatomy, technique).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Obtained informed consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Demonstrate appropriate preparation pre-procedure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Appropriate analgesia or sedation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Technical Ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Aseptic Technique	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Post Procedure Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Professionalism and consideration for patient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Overall Ability to perform Procedure	Competent to perform unsupervised <input type="checkbox"/>	May need supervision if complications arise <input type="checkbox"/>	Needs more practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:			
Assessor's Name			
MMC's Number			
Assessor's email			
<small>Please note: by providing your email address, Conjoint Board reserve the right to contact you to confirm individual assessments were conducted and completed in line with local procedures and by any good assessment practice</small>			
Assessor's position: <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant <input type="checkbox"/> Specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Registrar <input type="checkbox"/> Nurse <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify):			
Time taken for discussion (in minutes):		Time taken for feedback (in minutes):	
Assessor's signature:		Trainee's signature:	



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme Mini-Clinical Examination (Mini-CEX)

Date:

Trainee's Name																									
Date of enrolment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	Matric Number														
Date of assessment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	MMC Number														
Year of study											Posting														
Hospital																									
Clinical Setting:	<input type="checkbox"/> A&E <input type="checkbox"/> Clinic <input type="checkbox"/> In-patient <input type="checkbox"/> Neonates <input type="checkbox"/> Acute Admission																								
Clinical Problem Category:	<input type="checkbox"/> Sepsis <input type="checkbox"/> CVS <input type="checkbox"/> Shock <input type="checkbox"/> Gastro <input type="checkbox"/> Neuro <input type="checkbox"/> Airway/Breathing <input type="checkbox"/> Behaviour/Developmental <input type="checkbox"/> Others (Please specify):																								
Write a brief clinical summary of the case here e.g. a trainee teaching a parent how to use inhaler, assessment of breathing difficulty																									
Complexity of case in relation to stage of training: <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> High																									
Who chose this case? <input type="checkbox"/> Trainee <input type="checkbox"/> Assessor																									
Focus of clinical encounter: <input type="checkbox"/> History <input type="checkbox"/> Diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Management <input type="checkbox"/> Explanation																									
Areas of strength and suggestions for development:																									
Areas to consider for discussion and feedback												Comments													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> History Taking Communications skills with child / young person Communications skills with parent / carer Physical examination Clinical Judgement Initial Management Professionalism Organisation/efficiency 												Trainer to complete after discussion.													
In relation to THIS CASE , do you have any concerns about this trainee's knowledge base? <input type="checkbox"/> No concern <input type="checkbox"/> Minor concern <input type="checkbox"/> Serious concern																									
Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's knowledge base.																									



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme Mini-Clinical Examination (Mini-CEX)

Is there anything especially good you wish to comment on?

Agreed learning objectives:

Please describe what you have learned from this case. How will it change your practice in the future?

Trainee to complete

Please grade the area listed below using the given scale (1 -6)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. On the basis of THIS CASE , how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care for their stage of training | |
| 2. On the basis of THIS CASE , how would you rate this trainee's overall clinical care in relation to the standard expected at confirmation of completion of training | |

Scale

1. Unsafe
2. Below expectation
3. Meets expectation
4. Above expectation
5. Well above expectation
6. Unable to comment

In relation to **THIS CASE**, do you have any concern about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas not highlighted by the questions?

☐ No concern ☐ Minor concern ☐ Serious concern ☐ Unable to judge

Please document any concerns you have about this trainee's integrity, ethical, personal and professional practice or any other areas. Refer to Educational Supervisor if necessary.

Assessor's Name

MMC Number

Assessor's position: ☐ Consultant ☐ Specialist

Time taken for discussion (in minutes):

Time taken for feedback (in minutes):

Assessor's signature

Trainee's signature



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Discussion of Correspondence Assessment

Date:

Trainee's Name																												
Date of enrolment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	Matric Number																	
Date of assessment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	MMC Number																	
Year of study											Posting																	
Hospital																												

Type of written correspondence discussed: ☐ Outpatient letter ☐ Discharge summary ☐ Transfer letter ☐ Other (please specify)

Please detail the circumstances of the correspondence:

To be completed in advance by trainee

Please document your discussion with regard to the following areas, , you may find the following prompts useful:

Domain	Comments
Clarity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a separate clear problem list and plan? Is there jargon? (e.g.as in insurance reports) Is there logical flow? Any sentences you do not understand? 	
Clinical assessment <p>Is there clear documentation and appropriateness of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The history? The examination? Investigations? Impression? Medication with doses? Follow up? 	
Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there appropriate record of information shared with patient/family? Are the parents' or young person's questions addressed? Is/are the referring professionals question(s) addressed? Is there a clear plan for the recipient? 	

PLEASE MARK HOW MUCH YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT

"This document clearly conveys the information I would like to have about the patient if I were the recipient of the document"

1	2	3	4
No, very insufficient detail	No, would require a lot more detail	No, would require some more detail	Yes, the document conveys the information

Anything especially good?

Agreed learning objectives:

Please describe what you have learned from this case. How will it change your practice in the future?

Trainee to complete after discussion

On the basis of this assessment do you have significant concerns which should be discussed with the educational supervisor? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Assessor's Name																					
MMC Number											Assessor's position:	<input type="checkbox"/> Consultant <input type="checkbox"/> Specialist									
Assessor's signature:											Trainee's signature:										
Date:											Date:										

[Type here]

[illegible]

The behaviour outlined in the first box in each category is the 'gold standard' by which the student should be judged. A tick here indicates excellent performance. Tick in other boxes indicate performance that is good, satisfactory, further improvement necessary (i.e. borderline), further improvement essential (i.e. weak) in descending order

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently elicit problem related data from patient and other relevant sources, stresses important points, well organise approach.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above but less consistent.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above but sometimes concentrates on data not related to the problem, sometimes omits to consult other sources, occasionally misses important information.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approach not well organized, not always problem related, frequently misses important data.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approach not organized, frequently not problem related/wrongly elicit data, important data missed on most occasions

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently elicits and interprets correctly all signs, techniques and organizational approach consistently good.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistent.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, sometimes misses important physical signs.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approach technically imperfect and not very systematic: frequently misses important signs.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approach technically unacceptable and not systematic, important signs missed on most occasions.

[Type here]

Investigations		
Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently plans and interprets investigations appropriate to the problem with attention to specificity, reliability, patient safety and comfort, cost and, explain reasons for and nature of investigations to patients
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistent.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above but occasionally requests investigations not appropriate to the problem and/or without attention to specificity, reliability, etc. sometimes misses important data.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequently requests investigations not appropriate to the problem and/or without attention to specificity, reliability, patient safety and misses important data.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently makes inappropriate decisions in ordering investigations, consistently misinterprets and/or misses important data.
Diagnostic ability and reasoning		
Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently makes careful reasoned deductions from available data (history, physical examination, investigations) to arrive at the appropriate decision
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistent.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but occasionally makes incorrect deductions. Most times able to give correct provisional diagnosis.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequently does not follow a logical approach to deduction from available data, occasionally gives incorrect provisional diagnosis.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Illogical reasoning and deductions. Frequently makes incorrect diagnosis.
Procedural skills		
Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently carries out procedures with an appropriate level of technical skill and with due consideration to the patient.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistent.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but not equally skilled in all manipulative tasks.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not skilled in most manipulative tasks, occasionally exhibits lack of consideration and/or care and attention to detail.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Serious lack of skill in a number of manipulative tasks, frequently exhibits lack of care and attention to detail, not considerate to the patients.

[Type here]

Patient Management

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently suggests appropriate management, exhibits awareness of the role and possible complications of the proposed intervention (e.g. adverse drug reaction, surgical morbidity), self reliant and conscientious in approach, involves patients, family and community in management decision. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally suggests inappropriate management. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Shows some lack of awareness of role of proposed interventions and their possible complications, is unsure/not conscientious in implementing management. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently makes inappropriate management decisions |

Record Keeping

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently records legibly and updates accurately patient's problems and management progress, with emphasis on own observations and examinations and provides regular informative summary of progress. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally one or more aspects of record keeping inadequate. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Records are frequently illegible, not up-to-date, inaccurate and poorly organized. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Records are frequently inadequate according to above criteria |

Knowledge

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently applies appropriate knowledge of basic and clinical sciences to the solution of patient problems. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally has gaps in knowledge and/or difficulty in application to patient problems. However, makes effort to seek information. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Inadequate knowledge and/or difficulty in application to patients' problems. Sometimes makes effort to seek information. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | As in borderline, but lacks initiative in seeking information. |

Personal and Professional Attitudes

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently manages own learning by asking questions and searching for answers (proactive): improves progress as a learner and as a future practitioner by seeking feedback and acting on the latter, and shows evidence of accepting responsibility, being caring, thorough, trustworthy, self driven and respecting confidentiality.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistent or as effectively.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but with occasional deficiencies in self directed learning, self monitoring and/or professional qualities as defined above.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequently deficient in area as defined above.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently deficient in areas defined above

Communication skills

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently communicates with patients and his/her family, listens, be sensitive to the needs of the patients and family comforts, gives equal priority to the patient/family and the illness: establishes and maintains professional relationship with patient; realizes that the patient's attitude to the doctor affects management and cooperation: is aware that owns personality affects patient's reaction/behavior: provides information accurately and clearly.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistently or effectively.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but with occasional deficiency in communication skills as outlined above.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequently deficient in communicating skills outlined above.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently deficient in communicating skills outline above.

Conduct with Other Professionals

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently communicating/working with other professionals, is courteous, sensitive to needs of others: fulfils role in team appropriately by collaborating readily with others: provides clear information, instructions/advice to others: readily accepts reasonable advice/criticism from others.
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but less consistently or effectively.
Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above, but with occasional deficiencies in the areas outlined above.
Borderline	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequently deficient in areas outlined above.
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistently deficient in areas outlined above.

[Type here]

[illegible]

Overall Clinical Competence

- ### General comments regarding areas of concern

[Type here]



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Educational Supervisor's Report

Investigations

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently plans and interprets investigations appropriate to the problem with attention to specificity, reliability, patient safety and comfort, cost and, explain reasons for and nature of investigations to patients. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above but occasionally requests investigations not appropriate to the problem and/or without attention to specificity, reliability, etc. sometimes misses important data. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently requests investigations not appropriate to the problem and/or without attention to specificity, reliability, patient safety and misses important data. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently makes inappropriate decisions in ordering investigations, consistently misinterprets and/or misses important data. |

Diagnostic ability and reasoning

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently makes careful reasoned deductions from available data (history, physical examination, investigations) to arrive at the appropriate decision |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally makes incorrect deductions. Most times able to give correct provisional diagnosis. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently does not follow a logical approach to deduction from available data, occasionally gives incorrect provisional diagnosis. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Illogical reasoning and deductions. Frequently makes incorrect diagnosis. |

Procedural skills

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently carries out procedures with an appropriate level of technical skill and with due consideration to the patient. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but not equally skilled in all manipulative tasks. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not skilled in most manipulative tasks, occasionally exhibits lack of consideration and/or care and attention to detail. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Serious lack of skill in a number of manipulative tasks, frequently exhibits lack of care and attention to detail, not considerate to the patients. |



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Educational Supervisor's Report

Patient Management

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently suggests appropriate management, exhibits awareness of the role and possible complications of the proposed intervention (e.g. adverse drug reaction, surgical morbidity), self reliant and conscientious in approach, involves patients, family and community in management decision. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally suggests inappropriate management. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Shows some lack of awareness of role of proposed interventions and their possible complications, is unsure/not conscientious in implementing management. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently makes inappropriate management decisions. |

Record Keeping

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently records legibly and updates accurately patient's problems and management progress, with emphasis on own observations and examinations and provides regular informative summary of progress. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally one or more aspects of record keeping inadequate. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Records are frequently illegible, not up-to-date, inaccurate and poorly organized. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Records are frequently inadequate according to above criteria |

Knowledge

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently applies appropriate knowledge of basic and clinical sciences to the solution of patient problems. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but occasionally has gaps in knowledge and/or difficulty in application to patient problems. However makes effort to seek information. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Inadequate knowledge and/or difficulty in application to patients' problems. Sometimes makes effort to seek information. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | As in borderline, but lacks initiative in seeking information. |



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Educational Supervisor's Report

Personal and Professional Attitudes

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently manages own learning by asking questions and searching for answers (proactive): improves progress as a learner and as a future practitioner by seeking feedback and acting on the latter, and shows evidence of accepting responsibility, being caring, thorough, trustworthy, self driven and respecting confidentiality. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistent or as effectively. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but with occasional deficiencies in self directed learning, self monitoring and/or professional qualities as defined above. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently deficient in area as defined above. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently deficient in areas defined above |

Communication skills

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently communicates with patients and his/her family, listens, be sensitive to the needs of the patients and family comforts, gives equal priority to the patient/family and the illness: establishes and maintains professional relationship with patient; realizes that the patient's attitude to the doctor affects management and cooperation: is aware that owns personality affects patient's reaction/behavior: provides information accurately and clearly. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistently or effectively. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but with occasional deficiency in communication skills as outlined above. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently deficient in communicating skills outlined above. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently deficient in communicating skills outline above. |

Conduct with Other Professionals

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently communicating/working with other professionals, is courteous, sensitive to needs of others: fulfils role in team appropriately by collaborating readily with others: provides clear information, instructions/advice to others: readily accepts reasonable advice/criticism from others. |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but less consistently or effectively. |
| Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> | As above, but with occasional deficiencies in the areas outlined above. |
| Borderline | <input type="checkbox"/> | Frequently deficient in areas outlined above. |
| Weak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consistently deficient in areas outlined above. |



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Educational Supervisor's Report

Areas of progress and strength not covered above

(e.g. status of learning objectives, personal development plan (PDP) for specific areas, review portfolio)

Major achievements

(e.g. passed examinations, progress in research, presentation in conferences)

Areas for improvement

(e.g. timeliness, organizational skill, learning objectives or PDP not attained)

Assessor's Name

MMC Number

Assessor's position:

☐

Consultant

☐

Specialist

Assessor's signature

Student's signature



National Paediatric Postgraduate Training Programme

Multi source feedback - CONFIDENTIAL

Date:

Trainee's Name																												
Date of enrolment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	Matric Number																	
Date of assessment	D	D	/	M	M	/	Y	Y	Y	Y	MMC Number																	
Year of study											Posting																	
Hospital											Period of Assessment: (dd/mm/yyyy) _____ to _____																	

Assessor's position:

Consultant ☐ Specialist ☐ Senior Medical Officer ☐ Medical Officer ☐ House Officer ☐
 Matron/Sister ☐ Nurse/Paramedic ☐ Others (specify): _____

Location/Setting of assessment: General Paed Ward ☐ PICU ☐ NICU ☐ Special Care Nursery ☐
 Subspecialty /Other wards (Specify) ☐ _____

Grading : 5 – Above Expectations; 4- Meets Expectations; 3-Borderline; 2- Below expectations; 1- Area of concern

Domain	Grade	Comments	
		Anything especially good?	Any concerns?
Professional competence			
- clinical decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- Technical/procedural skills	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- aware of limitations, consults accordingly	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- able to prioritise	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- able to manage complex situations	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
Working with colleagues /Team work (medical officers, house officers, nurses)			
- responds quickly	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- accessible, reliable; punctual	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- arranges for cover	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- respects colleagues' confidentiality, rights and beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		
- respectful communication	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1		

[Type here]

