**QUALITY ASSURANCE OF EDUCATIONAL SUPERVISORS REPORTS**

**Educational Supervisor:**

**Trainee:**

**Date of report:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Needs further development** | | **Acceptable** | | **Excellent** | |
| **Evidence\*** | * No evidence linked or cited * Evidence not relevant to competency |  | * Links or cites appropriate evidence |  | * Links relevant evidence across a range of sources |  |
| **Commentary\*** | * No commentary * Commentary consists of general comments on trainee’s performance * Commentary is at odds with the evidence linked or cited |  | * Interprets evidence to provide meaningful comments on trainee’s progress |  | * Makes specific reference to how linked evidence does or does not support trainee’s progress * Where the trainee and ES ratings differ, there is an explanation given by the ES |  |
| **Ratings** | * Ratings not justified by the evidence * Ratings inappropriate to trainee’s stage of training |  | * Ratings justified by the evidence * Ratings appropriate to the stage of training |  | * Ratings are specifically aligned to competence descriptors |  |
| **Comments** |  | | | | | |

**\*** The level of detail provided in the trainee’s self assessment will determine how much detail is necessary in the ES report and judgements of ESR quality should reflect this