

**CIP**  
**IN-TRAINING EVALUATION REPORT**  
 Residents PGY 2 or higher – any level [MN1]  
 Completed every 6 months during the program

Rotation Location \_\_\_\_\_

Resident Name \_\_\_\_\_

All 7 CanMEDS roles are being assessed

- ☒ Medical Expert
- ☒ Communicator
- ☒ Collaborator
- ☒ Leader
- ☒ Advocate
- ☒ Scholar
- ☒ Professional

The following sources of information were used for this evaluation:

- ☐ engagement in or completion of a research project
- ☐ other evaluations

**Please review the Goals and Objectives before completing the form. These can be found by clicking the link below:**

<https://cip.utoronto.ca/goals-objectives-0>

**Please Note: 3 or higher is a pass.**

Below Expectations For Training Level		Meets Expectations For Training Level		Exceeds Expectations For Training Level	
1	2	3	4	5	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of performance in many aspects is lower than expected for trainees in this postgraduate level;</li> <li>Deficiencies are extreme and will not be remediable within the regular program.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of performance is consistent with expectations for trainees in this postgraduate level</li> <li>Performance is consistent with educational objectives.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of performance is outstanding and consistently exceeds expected for trainees in this postgraduate level</li> <li>Performance consistently exceeds levels of proficiency defined by the education objectives.</li> </ul>	



**Note to raters: A rating of 3 is a “pass”.**

<b>Medical Research Expert</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
1. Effectively manages activities for career development, including integration of clinical and research activities.						

<b>Communicator</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2. Communicates clearly with research participants, to establish rapport, trust, and ethical relationships.						
3. Effectively writes manuscripts.						
4. Effectively presents own work orally at lab meetings, research seminars, thesis advisory committee meetings, scientific meetings, and able to defend and discuss the presentation in an articulate and polished manner						

<b>Collaborator</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
5. Communicates clearly with peers and other professionals to establish rapport, trust and ethical relationships.						
6. Participates effectively and appropriately in interprofessional research teams, including working with others to prevent misunderstandings, manage differences and resolve conflicts.						
7. Forms effective collaborative relationships within the scientific community, where appropriate.						

<b>Leader</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
8. Effectively and efficiently manages research project and resources (financial & materials)						
9. Serves in administration and leadership roles, as appropriate to their research career						

<b>Health Advocate</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
10. Demonstrates appreciation of social economic and biologic factors that impact health research						
11. Advocates for the best interest for subjects/participants involved in research. Demonstrates concern that research subjects have access to appropriate supports, information, and services.						
12. Promotes research knowledge translation to patients, populations, communities, other stakeholders, as appropriate						

<b>Scholar</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
13. Effectively writes research proposals, reports, grant proposals and manuscripts						
14. Establishes and maintains knowledge and understanding of general principles and fundamentals of research, including research ethics						
15. Establishes and maintains knowledge and understanding of the specialized topics in the specific area of research						
16. Elicits, synthesizes, and critically evaluates information and applies it appropriately to research						
17. Demonstrates overall competence in techniques required for the research project (i.e. experimental design, data collection and management, and analysis)						



<b>Scholar</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
18. Demonstrates overall competence in analyzing and interpreting the results of an experiment						
19. Consults appropriately for feedback on knowledge and performance						

<b>Professional</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
20. Demonstrates commitment to profession, society, research participants, patients and collaborators through absolute objectivity, honesty, and adherence to ethical standards in the conduct and reporting of research						

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
21. <b>OVERALL RATING for this stage of research training</b>						

<b>Feedback &amp; Comments</b>
Describe Strengths
Actions or Areas for Improvement
Other Comments

**After the faculty member submits the ITAR, when the resident opens the ITAR, there are 2 standard questions that Residents must complete:**

1. I received detailed verbal feedback on my performance at or near the end of the rotation.
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
2. In general this evaluation accurately reflects my performance.
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

### **Evaluation of the Program Advisory Committee<sup>[MN2]</sup> (PAC) (also termed Thesis Committee)**

- 1) The PAC was conducted in a collegial and supportive manner
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 2) The CIP trainee is being coached in a constructively critical manner
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 3) The supervisor meets regularly with the CIP trainee and provides useful feedback
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 4) Do the answers to questions 1-3, above, reflect a consensus among members of the Program Advisory Committee
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 5) Comments

### **Additional Comments by Committee**

- 1) Does this report reflect the consensus of the whole thesis/research advisory committee?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 2) If no, will other notes be submitted separately?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
    - i. If no, please comment

### **Please list the thesis advisory committee members who contributed to this evaluation**

- 1) Name and area of expertise (fill in field)
  - a. Was present at the Thesis/Research Advisory Committee meeting?
- 2) Name and area of expertise (fill in field)
  - a. Was present at the Thesis/Research Advisory Committee meeting?
- 3) Name and area of expertise (fill in field)
  - a. Was present at the Thesis/Research Advisory Committee meeting?
- 4) Name and area of expertise (fill in field)
  - a. Was present at the Thesis/Research Advisory Committee meeting?

### **Complete for FINAL evaluation ONLY**

- 1) The Committee has reviewed the thesis. The student's final thesis draft has been read and proofed by all committee members. It is acceptable, in terms of content, quality of writing, and presentation. The thesis is ready for presentation at a formal oral examination.
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 2) The Committee has tested the student's presentation and oral defence of work. The student's presentation of the thesis was well organized, comprehensive and focuses. The student's ability to field questions related to the background and significance of research, general knowledge, and specific issues related to the thesis has been appropriately tested. The student is ready to defend the thesis at a formal oral examination.
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 3) The Committee has tested the student's general and specific knowledge related to research. The student has completed appropriate graduate courses for degree completion. The minimum degree requirements have been met. The student's basic scientific knowledge has been appropriately tested and is acceptable for thesis defence.
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

