Pain Medicine Standardized Letter of Evaluation

This sample template outlines the questions included in the standardized letter of evaluation for a Pain Medicine fellowship application in the 2027 ERAS® application season. It is intended for preparation purposes only and should not be uploaded. Letter writers must complete and submit evaluations using the standardized letter platform within the AAMC Letter Writer Portal.

Additional Letter Information

1a. Is this a group letter (i.e., evaluation based on aggregated evaluations and opinions from at least one other person)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1b. Additional Author Name(s) and Position(s) (Please specify)

_____

Writer Background

2. How many pain medicine applicants did you supervise over the last 5 years who applied to pain medicine fellowships?

3. What was the nature of your relationship with the applicant? (select all that apply)

I was/am their…

- ☐ Clinical faculty/supervisor (i.e., oversaw and provided hands-on guidance or feedback when applicant saw patients)
- ☐ Clerkship supervisor/director (i.e., responsible for rotation curriculum and evaluation)
- ☐ Research mentor
- ☐ Specialty/Career advisor
- ☐ Department Chair/Section Chief
- ☐ Associate Residency Program Director
- ☐ Residency Program Director (i.e., if you were the applicant's official program director while they were a resident in training)
- ☐ I did not interact directly with the applicant
- ☐ Other (please describe):

4. Over what period did you interact with the applicant in this capacity?

_

DO NOT UPLOAD

5. How many clinical days did you work with the applicant over this period?

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1-3 days
- ☐ 4-10 days
- ☐ 11-20 days
- ☐ 21+ days

6. In what setting(s) did you observe the applicant's performance? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Didactics, conference, or classroom
- ☐ Research (lab, research project, or writing a paper)
- ☐ Operating room/procedure clinic
- ☐ Inpatient service
- ☐ Outpatient service/clinic
- ☐ Private Practice
- ☐ Extracurricular/Volunteer/Committee activity
- ☐ Feedback from others (e.g., faculty, fellows, residents)
- ☐ Other (please describe):

Applicant Evaluation

Evaluate the applicant's proficiency on each dimension using the following rating scale. The majority of applicants should receive "Meets Expectations" because it reflects expected performance level of an applicant at the time they apply to fellowships. If the applicant is rated in the "Far Exceeds Expectations" or "Below Expectations" category, include written comments in the provided areas below each dimension to justify that rating.

Below Expectations - May occasionally meet expectations, but performance is uneven or inconsistent.
Meets Expectations - Reliably performs at the expected level under usual conditions.
Above Expectations - Often performs beyond expected levels even in situations of moderate complexity.
Exceeds Expectations - Regularly performs well above expected level, even in complex situations.
Far Exceeds Expectations - Consistently performs at an advanced level that is remarkable and rarely seen.
Unable to Rate - No opportunity to observe performance.

7. Work Ethic –Fulfills responsibilities reliably and on time, follows through on tasks, and is accountable for their actions and outcomes.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Work Ethic**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

DO NOT UPLOAD

8. Emotional Intelligence – Recognizes, understands, and empathizes with others' experiences, feelings, perspectives, and reactions, and maintains situational awareness to respond appropriately.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Emotional Intelligence**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

9. Teamwork – Engages with patients, peers, and interprofessional team members to constructively share information, support coordinated decision-making, and work effectively as part of a care team toward common goals to deliver high-quality, patient-centered care.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Teamwork**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

10. Communication Skills – Ability to exchange verbal, nonverbal, and written information clearly and respectfully with patients, families, and team members in diverse settings, demonstrates active listening, builds rapport, and ensures understanding to support effective interactions and shared understanding.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Communication Skills**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

11. Research Skill & Motivation – Actively engages in research by contributing to one or more stages of a research project (e.g., literature review, data collection, analysis) and demonstrates genuine interest and commitment to conducting research and advancing academic knowledge.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Research Skill & Motivation**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

12. Professionalism – Acts with honesty and integrity, treats others with respect, upholds ethical standards, and adheres to workplace expectations and standards.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Professionalism**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

13. Critical Thinking & Judgment - Applies advanced clinical reasoning to develop accurate diagnoses and evidence-informed, patient-centered management plans, evaluates alternative approaches, anticipates risks, and uses structured reasoning to make decisions in complex or ambiguous clinical situations.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Critical Thinking & Judgment**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

14. Coachability - Ability to openly receive and accept feedback, reflect on it, and adjust their behavior based on that feedback to improve performance and professional growth.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Coachability**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

15. Procedural Aptitude - Demonstrates the capacity to safely perform and develop foundational technical and procedural skills, integrating both technical precision and patient-centered care.

If you selected *Below Expectations or Far Exceeds Expectations* for **Procedural Aptitude**, please provide a behavioral example(s) to justify your rating. (300 characters)

DO NOT UPLOAD

Applicant Evaluation – Global Assessment

16. If you were ranking this applicant for your program they would be…

- ☐ Would not rank
- ☐ Lower rank (better than not matching)
- ☐ Middle rank (would be fine if they match with us)
- ☐ Higher rank (would be excited if they match with us)
- ☐ Ranked to match (top choice for matching with us)
- ☐ Not applicable

Written Comments

17. Please describe what makes this applicant stand out the most from their peers that will contribute to their success as a pain medicine fellow. (300 characters)

18. Please describe where this applicant can develop their skills to become a more well-rounded pain medicine fellow. (300 characters)

19. Please include any additional comments (not addressed above) about why you think this applicant will be well-suited to a career in pain medicine. (800 characters)

DO NOT UPLOAD