

SECTION TWO – HOUSE STAFF

POLICY NO: 2.2

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF HOUSE STAFF

I. PURPOSE

To establish guidelines for the periodic and final evaluation of each house officer within his or her designated Postgraduate Program, in accordance with the applicable Program Requirements.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES/PROCESS

A. Evaluation System:

Each Postgraduate Program shall have a system in place for the evaluation of house staff; and such system shall be used to assess the academic performance of each house officer against a set of written standards. This system must be followed uniformly for all house staff participating in a Postgraduate Program, and shall be consistent with SPUH and Department-specific policies and procedures, as applicable. The Program Director shall be responsible for informing house staff about the evaluation process, and shall make available to house staff any applicable policies and procedures upon request. By following a uniform evaluation system and communicating the same to the house staff, each house officer shall be apprised of their progress and professional development within the Postgraduate Program.

B. Feedback:

House staff shall be evaluated in writing by Teaching Staff and the Program Director. Written evaluations shall be given at least once every six (6) months during a house officer's participation in a Postgraduate Program, or more frequently, as specified by each Postgraduate Program's RRC. Program Directors shall provide house staff with timely feedback, particularly with regard to any deficiencies noted. In addition, each house officer shall receive a written final evaluation at the conclusion of their training. Any house officer who is accepted for an educational rotation which is less than four (4) months, shall only be evaluated in writing at the conclusion of their training.

Evaluation forms used by the Teaching Staff shall be developed by the Program Directors, with the assistance of the Department Chair, as appropriate, and supplied to the IGMEC.

The Program Director shall make an appointment with each house officer to review his/her evaluations. The house officer shall have the opportunity to discuss the results of every evaluation with the Program Director. The house officer shall sign his/her evaluation, and be entitled to indicate in writing on the evaluation form any disagreements he/she has with all, or any part of any periodic or final performance evaluation; or with a determination concerning annual advancement. Any house

officer may utilize the Grievance and Appeals Process Policy set forth in Policy No. VI.1.

Documentation of periodic performance evaluations shall be maintained in the house officer's permanent academic record.

C. Advancement:

Evaluations of the house officer are to be used in making decisions about promotion, Postgraduate Program completion, remediation, and disciplinary action. To the extent applicable, each Program Director shall determine whether a house officer will advance within his/her Postgraduate Program, based upon a house officer's satisfactory performance, measured by the evaluation system as described in this policy. Each Program Director's decision shall be based on the evaluations of the Teaching Staff, the Program Director's own personal observations of the house officer and any other information relevant to the house officer's performance. All determinations made by the Program Directors shall be subject to review and approval by the IGMEC.

Any and all academic matters, including in-training exams, shall be considered by the Program Director in determining whether a house officer is making satisfactory academic progress. Academic matters include acquisition of knowledge related to the discipline as well as all aspects of the development of clinical and professional skills necessary for effective functioning as a health care professional. Of particular importance, are academic issues such as, areas of professional development and ethics, maintaining professional relationships with patients, and maintaining relationships with other health care professionals, including subordinates, colleagues, and superiors.

D. Program Requirements: Professional and Academic Achievement:

Each Postgraduate Program must define the specific knowledge, skills, attitudes, and educational experiences required by each house officer; and provide educational experiences as needed in order for house staff to demonstrate, at a minimum, the following essential abilities:

1. Patient care that is compassionate, appropriate, and effective for the treatment of health problems and the promotion of health;
2. Medical knowledge about established and evolving biomedical, clinical, and cognate (i.e. epidemiological and social-behavioral) sciences and the application of this knowledge to patient care;
3. Practice-based learning and improvement that involves investigation and evaluation of their own patient care, appraisal and assimilation of scientific evidence, and improvements in patient care;
4. Interpersonal and communication skills that result in effective information exchange and teaming with patients, their families, and other health professionals;
5. Professionalism as manifested through a commitment to carrying out professional responsibilities, adherence to ethical principles, and sensitivity to a diverse patient population; and

6. Systems-based practice as manifested by actions that demonstrate an awareness of and responsiveness to the larger context and system for health care and the ability to effectively call on system resources to provide care that is of optimal value.

In addition, each Postgraduate Program must identify a mechanism to ensure that each participant achieves the following:

1. develops a personal program of learning to foster continued professional growth with guidance from Teaching Staff;
2. participates fully in the educational and scholarly activities of their Postgraduate Program and assumes responsibility for teaching and supervising other house officers;
3. is given the opportunity to participate on appropriate institutional and departmental committees and councils whose actions affect their education and/or patient care; and
4. participates in an educational program regarding physician impairment, including substance abuse.

E. Monitoring the Success of the Evaluation Process:

The Program Director will be responsible for establishing the mechanism and frequency of performance evaluations, in compliance with the Program Requirements applicable to each Postgraduate Program; and shall be monitored by the IGMEC internal review process.

In addition, SPUH shall ensure that house staff submit to the Program Director, at least annually, confidential written evaluations of SPUH faculty and of their educational experiences.

Approved: 4/2004
Reviewed & Approved 7/2007
Reviewed & Approved 6/2010