

CanMEDS Communicator Assessment tool A2

Consultation Letter Rating Scale^a

The unmodified content below was created by S. Dojeiji, E Keely and K. Myers. You may use, reproduce and modify the content for your own non-commercial purposes provided that your modifications are clearly indicated and you provide attribution to the authors. The prime author should be notified (canmeds@royalcollege.ca)of any changes that are made to this tool and the impactof its use in the users individual program. The authors may revoke this permission at any time by providing written notice.

Coaching

NOTICE: The content below may have been modified from its original form and may not represent the opinion or views of the Royal College.

Instructions for Assessor:

- Written communication competencies can be developed over time. Using the form below, please help this learner gain insight into and improve his/her written communication skills by providing valuable feedback on the consultation letter content and style .
- Circle your answer for each component of the consultation letter and for the global rating at the end.
- Use this rating scale with the letter you've reviewed as a springboard for discussion on how to improve future consultation letters.

Resident's Name:
PGY Level:
Supervisor's Name:
Date:

CONTENT

 1. HISTORY Identified chief proble Described the chief co Identified relevant pase 	ief problem/reason for referral e chief complaint		 Listed current medications, as appropriate Provided other history appropriate to presenting problem: Psychosocial history, functional history, family history, review of systems, etc. 		
POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	
1	2	3	4	5	
Missing relevant data		Most of relevant data		All relevant data	
		present		present	

POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT
1	2	3	4	5
Missing relevant physical exam		Most of relevant physical exam present		All relevant physica exam present

^a Dojeiji S, Keely E, Myers K. Used with permission.



OSO Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, 2015 EY NO SA canmeds.royalcollege.ca

3. IMPRESSION AND PLAN			• Stated whether the management plan was discussed			
 Provided diagnosis and/or differential diagnosis 			with patient			
Provided a management plan			Stated who would be responsible for elements of the			
Provided a rationale for the management plan			management plan and follow-up			
(education)			 Answered 	the referring phys	icians	question (if present)
POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEP	TABLE	GOOD		EXCELLENT
1	2	:	3	4		5
Key issues not		Most key is	sues			All key issues
addressed.		identified a	and			identified and
Did not answer		addressed.				addressed.
referring physician's		Answered				Answered referring
question.		referring p	hysician's			physician's question.
No rationale for		question.				Provided rationale for
recommendations.		Some ratio	nale for			recommendations
No education		recommen	dations.			made.
provided.		No educati	on			Provided education.
No indication of who		provided.				Clear plan for who
will do what.		Some indic	ation of			will do what and who
		who is				is responsible for
		responsible	e for			follow-up.
		manageme	•			Noted what patient
		elements a	ind			was told.
		follow-up.				

STYLE

4. CLARITY AND BREVITY			Length of	sentences:	
Words used:			one idea per sentence		
short (less than 3 syllables)			each sentence less than 3 lines long		
active voice			Length of		-
minimal medical jargon; minimal filler words/phrases			one topic pe	er paragraph	
no word or phrase repe	tition		each paragr	aph less than 4-5 sent	ences long
POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEPTABLE		GOOD	EXCELLENT
1	2	3		4	5
Wordy. Message		Concise. Minimal			Concise. Clear and
unclear Redundant		jargon and fillers.			organized.
words/phrases Lots	Some acti		ive tone.		No redundant
of jargon and fillers.	Some sho		ort		words/phrases.
Mostly passive tone.	sentences		5.		No jargon and fillers.
Long sentences.	Some senter		tences with		Active tone primarily.
Long paragraphs.		one idea/senten			Short sentences.
		Some sho	ort		One idea/sentence.
		paragrapl	ıs.		Short paragraphs.

	aling with lots of white mbered lists, tables, or	space graphics as appropriate		
POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT
1	2	3	4	5
No headings.		Some headings used.		Headings clear and
No white space.		Some white space.		appropriate
No bulleted or		Some bulleted and		Lots of white space.
numbered lists.		numbered lists.		Numbered
No tables.		Generally easy to		and bulleted lists.
Difficult to scan.		scan.		Use of graphics or
		Most key info		tables.
		easy to find.		Very easy to scan.



OVERALL RATING OF LETTER

Degree to which the let	Degree to which the letter is helpful to the referring physician					
POOR	BORDERLINE	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT		
1	2	3	4	5		
Letter not helpful.		Generally helpful as		Informative letter.		
Lacking key content.		key content		Element of education		
Lacking style		available. Limited or		incorporated.		
elements to make the		no education		Key information easy		
letter easy to scan		incorporated.		to find.		
Key info hard to find.		Some style elements				
		incorporated. Most				
		key information easy				
		to find (impression				
		and plan at a				
		minimum).				

Areas of strength (continue to do)	Areas for improvement (consider adding, consider modifying, or consider stopping)
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

Comments:

