



* indicates a mandatory response

Formative Assessment of Student by Tutor - Professional Competencies: Tutorial Engagement and Critical Thinking, with Self-Reflection (TECT-sr) rubric

For each scale (Critical Thinking, Tutorial Engagement, Self-Reflection), assess globally on a scale of 1 to 4. Students must perform satisfactorily on all scales to pass the Unit.

Improvement over the course of the year is expected in all areas. A student who is "satisfactory" on initial formative assessment is expected to improve over time to remain "satisfactory" or achieve "excellent."

General goals to guide your assessment or self-assessment are presented for each scale. At the end of the form, you will find **sample concrete statements** describing relevant behaviours to assist you.

Critical thinking

Our goals are that students should develop skills and attitudes that support their ability to:

- Raise pertinent, important, and even insightful questions about medical practice, patient experience, and community context.
- Identify, gather, and assess the right kind of evidence for the questions that are raised.
- Work through issues in a structured and rigorous manner, when appropriate, and use lateral, creative, and empathic thinking when these are appropriate.

	Does not meet expectations** (1)	Marginally meets expectations* (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Excellent (4)
*The student consistently brings critical thinking to bear on the cases, readings, and issues explored in this course:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Comments (describe at least one strength and at least one area for improvement):**

Tutorial Engagement

Our goals are that students should develop skills and attitudes that support their ability to:

- Contribute actively to a healthy learning culture of safety, respect, and trust, in which diverse viewpoints are expressed, elicited, acknowledged, explored, and sometimes challenged.
- Actively and constructively engage in situations of conflict or heightened emotion, neither avoiding conflict nor getting stuck in it.
- Be flexible in the role played in the team, able to facilitate, lead, follow, and support others.

	Does not meet expectations** (1)	Marginally meets expectations* (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Excellent (4)
*The student consistently engages with the team process, demonstrates respect for and curiosity about others' perspectives, and works through conflict and challenges:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Comments (describe at least one strength and at least one area for improvement):**

Self-reflection

Our goals are that students should demonstrate their ability to reflect on and continually improve their own approach to critical thinking and tutorial engagement. Important skills and attitudes for this include:

- Identifying appropriate standards (for critical thinking and team functioning) and reflecting on these to improve performance.
- Moderating emotional reactions to engage constructively and collegially with feedback, whether the feedback is expected or unexpected.

	Does not meet expectations** (1)	Marginally meets expectations* (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Excellent (4)
*The student demonstrates self-reflection as a means to monitoring and improving performance:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Comments (describe at least one strength and at least one area for improvement):**

Attendance

Please list dates (if any) on which student was absent. (UGME will review for excused/unexcused absences.)

Professionalism concern, if applicable

Professionalism concerns are not a matter of a scale of inadequate to excellent, and do not affect the "grade" on tutorial performance, but are used by UGME to capture and address persistent problems across Units.

Check this box if the student showed any of the following behaviours:

- Absences without notice
- Lateness
- Did not complete readings or did not take sufficient care with readings to be able to contribute effectively to group function (this would likely also cause a poor score in tutorial engagement: use this checkbox where lack of effort is suspected as the cause)
- Otherwise disrupted group function (describe below)

Description of concern (†required if professionalism concern indicated)

†required input

*marginally meets expectations - student does not consistently demonstrate ability to meet expectations in this category and is in danger of failing.

**does not meet expectations - student fails to demonstrate their ability to meet expectations in this category, and is in danger of failing [summative: fails the assessment].

Sample statements:

Critical thinking strengths	Critical thinking areas for improvement
Raises pertinent questions and observations about both cases and readings, across the domains of the Unit.	Doesn't proactively identify issues in cases and readings, or is limited to one domain.
Identifies implicit assumptions (their own and others'), both for promoting mutual understanding and for critique.	Contributions limited to factual reporting without critical evaluation of conclusions and assumptions, or reflective exploration of perspectives and feelings.
Brings fresh perspectives and resources to the group.	Relies uncritically on anecdote, authority, common sense, and/or provided readings.
Gathers info through structured approaches, paying attention to the reliability of sources.	Is failing to develop reliance on appropriate research strategies;
Raises appropriate critical appraisal questions, specific to the methodology of the study/appropriate to the question.	Reports results without critique, or uses a single dimension of critique (e.g. factual/non-factual, harm/benefit)

Critiques views in light of evidence/frameworks drawn from class materials and other sources.	Doesn't probe the assumptions behind own or others' views, or back up views with evidence/arguments
Integrates diverse kinds of information and reasoning to come to a practical approach to a case or issue.	Relies on one kind of evidence alone to inform the approach to issues.
Can take a general framework and customize its application, with flexibility and creativity, to individual patients, clinical contexts, and communities.	Difficulty in moving between individual and social--sees only the individual case without integrating determinants, or only the determinants, without seeing the individual.
Discerns and shares most important and/or pertinent info and perspectives.	Reports everything, not discerning importance.

Tutorial engagement strengths	Tutorial engagement areas for improvement
Presents in a clear and organized fashion, communicating effectively with group members	Unclear/disorganized presentation of information or views, which may be detrimental to others' learning.
Respectfully acknowledges and engages with different points of view.	Withdraws or communicates disrespectfully in the face of different perspectives and values.
Balances listening and contributing.	Monopolizes discussion--or doesn't take part in discussion.
Accepts role in group functioning, and specific tasks as appropriate.	Avoids taking on specific tasks for group functioning.
Helps others clarify their thinking or explore their assumptions, perspectives, and feelings.	Limits participation to one-way sharing of information/views, using only passive listening.

Can shift roles in the group (speaking/listening; leading/following; cooperating/challenging; inspiring others/responding to enthusiasm of others).	Is limited to one role in the group, however well they play that role.
Sensitive to non-verbal communication, both as sender and receiver.	Inappropriate nonverbal communication: “tunes out” and/or doesn’t read others’ body language.
Proactively addresses group problems, and/or responds when others raise group problems.	Denies problems or minimizes problems rather than contributing to dealing with them.
Maintains composure and engagement in the presence of emotions/disagreements.	Loses composure in presence of emotion/disagreement, or avoids emotion/disagreement;
Gives constructive feedback.	Tactless in feedback, or avoids giving feedback.

Self-reflection strengths	Self-reflection areas for improvement
Comes prepared, having reviewed and reflected on standards and prior feedback.	Demonstrates a lack of awareness of standards and no reflection on prior feedback.
Thoughtfully describes own learning strategies (e.g. tutorial preparation).	Is unable to describe own learning strategies (uses only generic descriptions like “fine” or “not very good”).
Is able to devise and implement new learning strategies.	Stays with one approach to learning, not demonstrating growth and development.
Thoughtfully describes and reflects on specific facets of group dynamics, demonstrating an understanding of team functioning, respect, and fairness.	Is unable to specifically describe team dynamics (uses only generic descriptions like “fine” or “not very good”).

Seeks constructive feedback in general and specific help when needed.	Doesn't seek feedback or help when needed.
Maintains composure and engagement in the presence of unexpected or challenging feedback.	Loses composure and is unable to engage constructively in the presence of unexpected or challenging feedback.
Recognizes areas for improvement.	Doesn't recognize areas for improvement.
Receives and weighs feedback and willingly acts on it, consistently improving skills/performance.	Is dismissive of feedback, shifting blame or minimizing others' perspectives.

The following will be displayed on forms where feedback is enabled...

(for the evaluator to answer...)

(for the evaluatee to answer...)

*Did you have an opportunity to discuss your performance with your preceptor/supervisor?

Yes

No

*Do you agree with this assessment?

Yes

No

If you do not agree with your assessment, please provide your comments below and notify the UGME office at ugme@dal.ca. Comments you provide are viewable by your evaluator and the UGME Office.