**ASSESSMENT OF OBSERVATIONAL PLACEMENT PERFORMANCE**

***To be completed online in InPlace – a link will be sent to all supervisors.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Accuracy of Data Tracking by Last 2-3 Days:** | **Grade** |
|[ ]  At least 80% accurate; required intermittent to no support to ensure accuracy | 5 |
|[ ]  60-79% accurate independently; required periodic support to ensure accuracy | 4 |
|[ ]  30-59% accurate independently; required frequent support to ensure accuracy | 2 |
|[ ]  Less than 30% accurate independently; required constant support to ensure accuracy | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Quality of Self-Directed Learning Behaviour**The student asked insightful questions, initiated clinical discussions, set and achieved own learning plans, sought new knowledge, tied new knowledge to old knowledge: | **Grade** |
|[ ]  Consistently (required little to no support to ensure learning) | 5 |
|[ ]  Frequently (required intermittent monitoring and support to ensure learning) | 4 |
|[ ]  Sometimes (required frequent monitoring and direction to ensure learning) | 2 |
|[ ]  Rarely (required constant monitoring and direction to ensure learning) | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Accuracy of Observations Described in Observation-Reflection Logs:** | **Grade** |
|[ ]  At least 80% accurate | 5 |
|[ ]  60-79% accurate | 4 |
|[ ]  30-59% accurate | 2 |
|[ ]  Less than 30% accurate | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Quality of Reflections in Observation-Reflection Logs** | **Grade** |
|[ ]  Excellent (described a range of experiences, clearly and consistently tied experiences to their functional importance, made astute recommendations for further learning and/or application, provided evidence of a constructive change in perspective or approach) | 8 |
|[ ]  Great (demonstrated all of the above in most but not all reflections) | 7 |
|[ ]  Good (included good experience examples and tied them to their functional importance, but was variable in the robustness of recommendations for further learning and/or application and in the robustness of evidence provided of a constructive change in perspective or approach) | 5 |
|[ ]  Fair (included good experience examples but demonstrated weak analysis of functional importance with unclear intentions for further learning and/or application) | 3 |
|[ ]  Poor (frequently included weak experience examples, showed limited to no evidence of attempting to reach an understanding of relevance and/or application, demonstrated limited to no change in quality of analysis over time) | 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Quality of Research Inquiry Project** | **Grade** |
|[ ]  Completed work independently; demonstrated analysis and synthesis of current, relevant, peer-reviewed research literature; summarized literature review in an easy-to-follow format; clearly answered the question | 7 |
|[ ]  Completed work with intermittent support; demonstrated analysis and synthesis of current, relevant, peer-reviewed research literature; summarized literature review in an easy-to-follow format; clearly answered the question | 6 |
|[ ]  Final product was helpful but was lacking in one of the three required areas (critical appraisal, clarity of writing, clarity of answering question) | 4 |
|[ ]  Final product did not clearly draw the reader to a conclusion as it was lacking in two of the three areas (critical appraisal, clarity of writing, clarity of answering question) | 2 |
|[ ]  Literature review was sparse with questionable analysis of source or study calibre; conclusion was vague or not well supported | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL GRADE (OUT OF 30):** |  |
| **Comments from Clinical Instructor:**       |