

## **Scales on Evaluation Forms**

Notes by Craig Gjerde, PhD, University of Wisconsin  
[clgjerde@wisc.edu](mailto:clgjerde@wisc.edu) July 2005

### TRADITIONAL SCALES

The 1-9 scales where everyone gets a score of 7 or 8 are probably not useful in rating competency. There is no easy way to convert the scores into a competency rating.

Different types of response scales seem to be used with competency assessment. Note that many scales below include “Not Applicable” and “Not Observed”, although these may not be appropriate in every case.

SCALES TYPE A. Where the evaluator is appropriate to judge competence (eg, faculty in department, clinicians)

### COMPETENCY-FOCUSED

Item A1 [eg, “Resident washed hands”] {Used in OSCE situation}

- Not Applicable
- Not Observed
- No
- Yes

Item A2 [eg, “Resident applied dressing.]

- Not Applicable
- Not Observed
- Not yet competent
- Competent at level of graduate

Item A3 [eg, “Resident applied dressing.]

- Not Applicable
- Not Observed
- Not yet competent
- Competent for level of training
- Competent at level of graduate

Item A4 [eg, “Resident applied dressing.]

- Not Applicable
- Not Observed
- Not yet competent
- Competent for level of training
- Competent at level of graduate
- Competent at expert level

SCALES TYPE B. Used where the evaluator is not appropriate to judge competence (eg, faculty in different department, patients). Provides *data* for department faculty to interpret.

## BEHAVIOR-FOCUSED

Item B1 [eg, "Resident arrived on time.]"

- Not Applicable
- Not Observed

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Usually
- Always

Item B2 [eg, "I would recommend the resident to a friend."]

- Strongly Agree {This is a Likert [Lick-urt] scale}
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Item B3 [eg, "I would recommend the resident to a friend."]

- Strongly Agree {This is a Likert [Lick-urt] scale}
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree {Adding this "neutral" category is debatable}
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

---

## NOTE:

Sometimes a scoring scheme (or RUBRIC) is needed to judge a piece of written work, an analysis, a case or a performance. In these cases, the evaluator must create examples of the type of evidence that will earn the work each category of the grading scale (whether pass/fail or more categories as shown below).

Item C1 [eg, "Grade the written plan"]

One example might be:

A - EXCELLENT (85 - 100) - A Markedly Exceptional Performance

{pick relevant terms for each grade from those listed below}

a comprehensive grasp of the subject matter is demonstrated, including an in-depth understanding of the relevant concepts, theories, and issues related to the topic addressed

an awareness of differing view-points is demonstrated and a rigorous assessment of these undertaken where relevant

an ability to think critically is demonstrated in the analysis, synthesis and evaluation of relevant information

a thoughtful statement of position is presented and defended through logical arguments and carefully selected supportive detail; the arguments presented build to a consistent conclusion

originality, insight, and creativity are demonstrated; the paper goes beyond repeating what others have said and contributes something new to our understanding of the topic

a clear, fluent, and concise style highlights a well-written, tightly argued, and logically structured essay

a virtually flawless mastery of all aspects of grammar, structure, and style is demonstrated

#### B - SUPERIOR (70 - 84) - Clearly Above Average Performance

a thorough grasp of the subject matter is demonstrated

an awareness of differing view-points is demonstrated and an assessment of these attempted where relevant

the paper goes beyond description to interpretation, analysis, synthesis and evaluation

a position is adopted and logically argued; appropriate supporting detail is supplied

a clear style which communicates well (but may contain occasional or minor flaws in the mechanics of spelling, grammar, sentence structure, etc.) is evident in the logical presentation of a reasonable argument

#### C - SATISFACTORY (55 - 69) - A Fully Competent Paper

a basic grasp of the subject matter is demonstrated

accurate information incorporating relevant sources and references is conveyed

a position is adopted and logically argued

an adequate attempt at analysis, synthesis, interpretation or evaluation is evident

an acceptable style demonstrates an awareness of, and attention to, the principles of paragraph development, sentence structure, grammar and spelling, etc.

#### D - POOR (40 - 54) - A Marginally Acceptable Paper [This is considered a pass]

a lack of familiarity with the subject matter is demonstrated through the omission of key material, or through the misinterpretation of important concepts, theories or issues

a lack of critical thinking is evident in a paper which is more descriptive than interpretive; or in which the analysis and synthesis are logically flawed; or in which there is a reliance on assertion; or in which the relevance of supporting detail is questionable

a position is not taken, is hard to determine, or is inconsistent with arguments or information presented in the paper

there is a lack of originality and an over-reliance on material presented in class or in the assigned readings

written expression requires improvement in basic communication skills; or written communication is marred by inflated diction, overly complex sentence structures, or an obtuse style.

#### F - FAILING (0 - 39) - An Unacceptable Performance

a basic lack of understanding of the subject matter is demonstrated through gross misinterpretation or omissions

there is little attempt to go beyond description; or interpretation and analysis demonstrates gross error in logic or supporting detail

little or no factual material is presented; or material presented contains gross factual error; or is completely irrelevant

written expression is disorganized, incoherent, poorly expressed, and contains

unacceptably frequent or serious errors in grammar, sentence structure, and spelling  
an attempt is made to use other authors' work without providing proper  
acknowledgment  
an attempt is made to hand in a paper from another course  
an attempt is made to write a paper on a topic other than that approved in writing by  
the instructor

- these marking criteria compiled by R. Runté and K. Mazurek