

Item_ID	Item	Item_Description	Level_0 (Not Done/Inappropriate)	Level_1 (Minimal)	Level_2 (Needs Improvement)	Level_3 (Acceptable)	Level_4 (Strong)	Level_5 (Exemplary)	Score (0-5)
Q1	Domain Coverage and Performance Differentiation	Feedback shows sufficient variability to identify relative strengths and weaknesses of the learner, rather than describing performance in general terms.	Feedback provides only vague or generic statements with no differentiation. (e.g., "good job today")	A single, specific aspect of performance is addressed but remains uniform across tasks, with minimal differentiation. (e.g., "needs to speak louder next time")	Addresses few domains, with limited detail and little connection to observed performance; major areas are omitted.	Addresses several domains but unevenly; some detail missing.	Covers most domains with appropriate emphasis and rationale, as well as contextual detail.	Comprehensive, specific review of all major consent domains with balanced emphasis.	
Q2	Balance of Strengths and Improvements	Comments are balanced, providing both strengths and areas for improvement.	Only strengths or only weaknesses are included; no balance is provided. (e.g., "you did everything perfectly" OR "this was poorly done")	Feedback is heavily one-sided toward either strengths or weaknesses and lacks detail. (e.g., "good case overall, but lots to fix")	Mentions both strengths and weaknesses but lacks depth and proportionality. (e.g., "you explained the procedure but missed two major steps")	Both strengths and weaknesses are present with basic detail.	Balanced, specific strengths and weaknesses with fair weighting.	Highly balanced, well-evidenced strengths and weaknesses with clear proportionality.	
Q3	Justification of Judgments or Scoring	Comments provide justification for the assigned performance scores.	No justification provided; rating appears arbitrary.	Minimal justification (e.g., generic statement) not tied to behaviors.	Partial justification; loosely linked to behaviors or outcomes.	Clear justification tied to observed behaviors for most elements.	Strong justification with direct evidence supporting the assigned score.	Compelling, behaviorally anchored justification that integrates multiple observations to support the assigned score.	
Q4	Specific Examples of Strengths	Clearly explained examples of strengths using specific descriptions (not generalizations) are provided.	No strengths described; or purely generic praise.	One generic strength with no specifics or examples.	At least one specific example, but vague or lacking context.	Two or more specific examples of strengths tied to observed behaviors or outcomes.	Concrete, specific, and contextualized strengths across key tasks.	Rich, behaviorally anchored examples of strengths that illustrate their impact on the quality of the informed consent encounter.	
Q5	Specific Examples of Weaknesses	Clearly explained examples of weaknesses using specific descriptions (not generalizations) are provided.	No weaknesses described.	One generic weakness with no specifics or examples (e.g., "be more detailed")	At least one specific weakness but vague or lacking context. (e.g., "omitted serious complications")	Two or more specific examples of weaknesses tied to observed behaviors or outcomes.	Concrete, specific, and contextualized weaknesses across key tasks; nuanced weaknesses tied to behaviors and impact on consent quality.	Rich, behaviorally anchored examples of weaknesses that illustrate their impact on the quality of the informed consent encounter.	
Q6	Actionable Recommendations	Concrete recommendations are provided to attain a higher level of performance.	No recommendations; or advice is irrelevant.	Generic advice (e.g., "read more"); not actionable.	Partially actionable recommendation but lacks sufficient specificity or guidance for implementation. (e.g., "be clearer")	Actionable recommendation with specific guidance or resources for improvement. (e.g., "summarize major risks before closing")	Specific, focused recommendations with concrete strategies or examples for implementation. (e.g., "use Ask-Tell-Ask to check patient understanding")	Tailored and prioritized recommendations with clear strategies and exemplar approaches for future encounters.	
Q7	Supportive Professional Tone	Comments are provided in a supportive, respectful manner.	Tone dismissive/unduly critical; potentially undermining psychological safety.	Minimal support; language may be blunt or discouraging; overly critical.	Neutral tone; limited supportive language.	Generally supportive tone; respectful phrasing.	Consistently supportive and respectful; encourages growth.	Highly supportive, empathic tone; models growth mindset and encourages continued development.	
Q8	Clarity and Comprehensiveness	Overall, the feedback provides sufficient detail for an independent reviewer to clearly understand the learner's performance.	Insufficient detail for an independent reviewer to understand what occurred or determine the learner's level of performance; feedback is poorly organized.	Sparse detail with key elements missing; provides an incomplete picture of performance and/or lacks clear organization.	Basic outline present; gaps remain in important areas.	Adequate detail to understand most aspects of performance.	Comprehensive, coherent account enabling clear understanding.	Highly comprehensive, coherent narrative that integrates context, behaviors, and outcomes.	

Total Feedback Quality Score: _____/40