

RCGP ESR Quality criteria

ESR Needs Further Development	ESR Acceptable	ESR Excellent
<p>a) The basis for judgements is not clear, i.e. they are not referenced to the evidence. I.e. they are not linked to evidence or there is a substantial lack of evidence to support the judgments made by the Educational Supervisor.</p> <p>b) Where the judgements can be evaluated, they do not appear to be justifiable. I.e. where evidence <i>has</i> been cited for any judgments, the accuracy or robustness of the linked evidence is questionable.</p> <p>c) Suggestions for trainee development are inadequate in number and/or quality. I.e. constructive suggestions for how the candidate might progress are lacking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements are generally referenced to a range of the available, relevant evidence, and include interpretation of this evidence. • Judgements appear to be justifiable • Suggestions for trainee development are routinely made and appear to be appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements show sophistication, synthesising evidence from a number of sources • The supervisor comments on the quality and range of evidence-set in order to improve trainee insight and future data • Suggestions for trainee development clarify the learning outcomes to be achieved

RCGP Criteria for quality of clinical supervisors reports

CSR Acceptable	CSR Needs Further Information
<p>a) Free text comments are specific and constructive</p>	<p>c) There is little or no formative feedback to the learner</p>
<p>b) Where underperformance is noted or concerns are highlighted, free text comment is made and evidence cited</p>	<p>d) Where grades are 'borderline' or 'below expectation', insufficient free text comment is made and little or no detail about concerns provided.</p>