

## Anesthesiology Resident and Attending Perceptions of Written Evaluation Comments

Kevin W. Hatton, M.D., Amy DiLorenzo, Maria Melguizo-Castro, M.S., Randall M. Schell, M.D.  
Department of Anesthesiology at the University of Kentucky College of Medicine

**Learner Audience:** Anesthesiology Residency Program affiliated with University Hospital

**Background:** Anesthesiology residents are routinely evaluated using a variety of evaluation methods including written examination, oral examination, and written focal faculty evaluations. Written focal faculty evaluations typically have specific sections where unsolicited written comments to residents can be provided.

**Hypothesis:** This study was designed to determine whether there was a difference in the perception of these comments (in terms of being either positive or negative) between anesthesiology residents and attending faculty staff.

**Method Design:** All anesthesiology residents and attending faculty in the Department of Anesthesiology at the University of Kentucky were asked to assess their perception of 50 randomly-selected statements from previously-submitted daily focal faculty evaluations of residents from 07/2008-12/2008 using an anonymous internet-based survey. These statements were evaluated on an ordinal scale from "extremely negative (-10)" to "extremely positive (+10)". The mean perception rating of each comment was then compared between the groups. Institutional review board approval was obtained post-hoc to present data.

**Outcome:** Twenty-seven faculty members (60%) and 29 residents (63%) completed the survey. The data from 2 faculty and 3 residents were excluded from analysis. There were no statistical differences in the mean perception ratings between the two groups in the majority of the statements (N=40 (80%)). Of the 10 comments with a statistical difference between the mean perception ratings, residents perceived the positive comments (N=6) to be more positive than did the faculty and the negative comments (N=4) to be more negative than did the faculty. (Figure 1) This data supports the continued use of free-form faculty evaluation of residents to communicate their overall impression of the residents' performance. This data should, however, be repeated in a larger, multi-institutional study to more-fully evaluate the differences in comment perceptions between residents and faculty.

Figure 1: Differences in mean perception rating between faculty and resident responses. (MPR = Mean Perception Rating, SD = Standard Deviation)

Comments:	Faculty MPR (SD)	Resident MPR (SD)	p-Value
"Outstanding attitude and interpersonal skills."	7.81 (2.45)	9.14 (1.43)	0.0189
"Great resident. I hope he will stay with us as a faculty member."	7.59 (2.52)	9.00 (2.05)	0.0253
"Very close to being ready for independent practice."	7.22 (1.93)	9.00 (1.00)	0.0001
"Your skills have come along nicely."	3.74 (2.43)	5.34 (2.64)	0.0217
"Does his best for patient care."	2.96 (2.67)	4.69 (2.42)	0.0140
"Committed to improving interactions with nursing staff, and patients."	2.74 (2.38)	4.34 (2.82)	0.0258
"Needs to interact more in the room and maintain patient overview"	-1.15 (3.55)	-2.96 (2.24)	0.0288
"Struggled a bit more than I would have expected with airway management."	-2.04 (2.77)	-3.62 (2.50)	0.0285
"Was not adequately prepared for the rotation and did not read on her own about specific patient care issues."	-5.04 (4.49)	-7.24 (3.58)	0.0466
"Substantially below my expectations"	-6.00 (4.64)	-8.18 (2.68)	0.0399