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INTRODUCTION

• The Ottawa Emergency Department Shift Observation Tool (O-EDShOT) is a workplace-based assessment (WBA) designed to assess a trainee’s performance across an entire shift¹
• Developed in response to validity concerns with traditional end-of-shift WBAs, such as the daily encounter card (DEC)²-⁴
• O-EDShOT has previously demonstrated strong psychometric characteristics
• Unknown whether the O-EDShOT facilitates measurable improvements in the quality of documented assessments compared to DEC¹

RESULTS

• CCERR scores were significantly higher for O-EDShOTs (Mean ± SD: 25.6 ± 2.6) compared to DECs (21.5 ± 3.9) (p<0.001)
• A-CCERR scores were also significantly higher for O-EDShOTs with (Mean ± SD: 18.5 ± 1.6) compared to DECs (15.5 ± 1.2) (p<0.001)
• CCERR items 1, 4 and 9 were rated significantly higher for O-EDShOTs compared to DECs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCERR Item</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>O-EDShOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Checklist/numeric ratings show sufficient variability to allow identification of relative strengths and weaknesses of the trainee.*</td>
<td>2.3 (0.7) 0.6</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3) 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comments are balanced providing both strengths and areas for improvement.</td>
<td>2.7 (0.5) 0.8</td>
<td>2.9 (0.4) 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The trainee’s response to feedback and/or remediation during the shift or rotation is described in the comments.</td>
<td>1.1 (0.2) 0.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.2) 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comments justify the ratings provided.*</td>
<td>2.3 (0.4) 0.7</td>
<td>2.9 (0.4) 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clearly explained examples of strengths using specific descriptions (not generalizations) are provided in the comments.</td>
<td>2.5 (0.7) 0.7</td>
<td>2.9 (0.8) 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clearly explained examples of weaknesses using specific descriptions (not generalizations) are provided in the comments.</td>
<td>2.2 (0.7) 0.8</td>
<td>2.6 (0.6) 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Concrete recommendations for the trainee to attain a higher level of performance are provided.</td>
<td>2.6 (0.6) 0.8</td>
<td>2.9 (0.6) 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Comments are provided in a supportive manner.</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2) 0.6</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2) 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall, this assessment provides enough detail for an independent reviewer to clearly understand the trainee’s performance on the shift.*</td>
<td>2.6 (0.5) 0.8</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3) 0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

• O-EDShOT yields higher quality documented assessments when compared to the traditional end-of-shift DEC
• Provides additional validity evidence for the O-EDShOT as an assessment tool for capturing trainee on-shift performance
• O-EDShOT can be used as a stimulus for driving actionable feedback and as a source for high-quality WBA data to inform decisions about emergency medicine trainee progress and promotion

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

• Study conducted at a single centre
• Different institutions have unique assessment cultures
• We intend to conduct a multicenter implementation study of the O-EDShOT to collect additional validity evidence across training programs with varying assessment systems and cultures
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METHODS

• 3 randomly selected DECs and 3 O-EDShOTs completed by 24 faculty were scored by two raters using the Completed Clinical Evaluation Report Rating (CCERR)
• CCERR is a previously published 9-item quantitative measure of the quality of a completed WBA²
• Automated-CCERR (A-CCERR) scores, which do not require raters, were also calculated⁶
• Paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare the quality of assessments between O-EDShOTs and DECs

OBJECTIVE

• To assess whether the O-EDShOT facilitates higher quality of documented assessments of trainees when compared to the traditional DEC
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Table 1. Mean (SD) and item total correlations (ITC) for CCERR items across DEC and O-EDShOT assessment forms.

*T denotes significantly higher (p<0.05) scores for CCERR items 1, 4 and 9 for the O-EDShOT as compared to the DEC.