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Clinical Encounter Cards (CEC) that encourage faculty to provide student feedback have been shown to improve students’ perception of quality and quantity of feedback.

Effective and timely feedback is essential to medical student education and can be used in summative evaluations for clinical clerkships. However, it is not clear whether methods, such as CECs, translate into additional and more substantive comments on the submitted formal written evaluation of a student upon completion of the clerkship.

The goal of our study was to determine if the quality of final student evaluations were improved through use of CECs.

While the improved perception of feedback by students is important, quality comments documented on their final rotation evaluation regarding their performance on clinical clerkships are critical to appropriate summation of their rotation, grade assignment, and a meaningful MSPE (Dean’s Letter). These can ultimately impact the student’s success in securing letters of recommendation and residency positions.

Methods
We did a retrospective review of formal faculty completed student evaluations before and after the implementation of a CEC. The evaluations spanned 3 academic years. The evaluations from the two groups were compared by quantifying the number of specific and actionable comments documented by faculty on their final submitted student clerkship evaluation form. Statistical significance was determined using a two-tailed t-test.

Results
The number of comments on the final clerkship evaluations between the two groups was not statistically different ($p = 0.13$).

Conclusion
While a CEC does improve the feedback process for students, it did not add documented information about student performance to the official student record in the form of their clerkship evaluation. The CEC as a stand-alone process was not effective in producing an increased quantity of summative or formative comments on the clerkship evaluation.