

REFERENCE TABLE

Criteria for assessment of Performance in the Long Case

Assessment Domains → Level of Performance ↓	History	Examination	Synthesis & Priorities	Impact of illness on patient and family	Management Plan
Exceptional Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional attention to detail • Highly sophisticated interpretation • Mature understanding of complex issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly mature, systematic, well structured completion of complex examination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very sophisticated and intelligent synthesis • Mature and competent arrangement of interactive problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly sophisticated, well balanced and complete understanding of psychological and social aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sophisticated management plan incorporating all therapeutic options • Mature anticipation of prognosis • Ability to adjust management plan for different outcomes
Much Better than Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sophisticated interpretation of the history • Focuses on key issues • Shows maturity in extracting difficult information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively seeks subtle signs that might enhance diagnosis • Superior organisation of difficult examination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies all major and minor problems • Vary careful prioritisation which includes a long term view • Recognises social impact of disease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows mature understanding of subtle, difficult, or intimate aspects of patient's functioning • Demonstrates balance when discussing issues and sophisticated use of external social support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior construction of management plan, including long term impact • Highly developed and discriminating use of investigations • Mature recognition and interpretation of inconsistent results
Better than Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on appropriate details • Appreciates subtleties • Interprets significant aspects of the history 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes important relative negative signs • Appreciates significance of more subtle signs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidently identifies essential problems • Shows maturity in recognising lesser issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows persistence in exploring subtle psychological issues, or issues that impact on the patient or family 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes appropriate management plan with good understanding of social impact lifestyle and psychological aspects of disease • Good use of discriminating investigations • Accurate interpretation of results
Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and accurate history • Minimal need to clarify details • Timely and well structured • Some interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly identifies all important physical signs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified all key problems • Arranges problems in order of priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands patient's physical and psychological functioning in relation to disease • Appreciates impact of treatment and prognosis on patient and family 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes an appropriate management plan for the major issues • Provides a sensible, balanced approach to investigations • Interprets investigations appropriately • Recognises important side effects of proposed treatment
Short of Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly organised • Omission of some key issues • Need to clarify important details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omission of some important physical signs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems poorly prioritised • Significant problems undervalued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to recognise some important aspects of the disease on patient or family • Misses some aspect affecting functioning or reaction to illness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking confidence and including some errors in arranging a management plan • Erratic and non-discriminatory use of investigations • Errors in the interpretation of tests • Lacking some appreciation of complication of treatment
Well Short of Expected Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omission of many key points • Inaccuracies or lack of detail • Repetitive, poorly structured • Need to spend substantial time in clarifying details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many significant signs not recognised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor understanding of significant problems • Requires substantial prompting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor understanding of the impact of disease on patient and family • Shows little concern about psychological aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate or poorly directed management plan • Poor understanding of useful investigations • Inability to interpret investigations • Major inability to appreciate side effects of treatment
Very Poor Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear structure • Focused only on single problem • Minimal detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal attention to detail with the examination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most key management issues unidentified • No attempt to establish priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of disease not explored at all, or unable to be discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly directed management plan without regard to major issues • Very poor ordering of investigations without regard to expense or potential complications • No attempt to interpret investigations • No understanding of side effects of treatment