

## AFRM Clinical Examination Professional Behaviour Rating Scale

ASSESSMENT DOMAINS	VERY POOR PERFORMANCE (0 marks)	WELL BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD (1 mark)	BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD (2 marks)	EXPECTED STANDARD (3 marks)	BETTER THAN EXPECTED STANDARD (4 marks)	EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE (5 marks)
Communication / rapport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not interact with the patient or role player</li> <li>Interactions characterised by reckless, dangerous and hurtful behaviour and a lack of insight, causing distress to the patient or role player</li> <li>Requiring examiners to intervene</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interactions characterised by crude, rude, insensitive behaviour, causing distress to the patient or role player</li> <li>Demonstrates no empathy or sensitivity to the needs of the patient or role player</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interactions that are occasionally inappropriate or insensitive</li> <li>Demonstrates some empathy and recognition of the patient or role player's needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduces himself/herself to the patient</li> <li>Completes hand hygiene</li> <li>Shows respect for patient as indicated by preservation of patient's modesty, seeking permission for sensitive aspects of examination</li> <li>Recognises and modifies examination when painful</li> <li>Demonstrates empathy and an ability to reflect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected standard plus</li> <li>Ability to adjust communication styles to suit the occasion</li> <li>Ability to approach challenging conversations with tact and skill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better than expected standard plus</li> <li>Graceful, confident demeanour</li> <li>Respects and maintains the patient or role player's dignity at all times</li> </ul>
Quality of physical examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reckless, dangerous and hurtful examination requiring examiners to intervene</li> <li>Cannot or did not perform appropriate examination of system</li> <li>Makes multiple mistakes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very slow, rough, clumsy and disorganised in approach</li> <li>Misses essential signs</li> <li>Finds major abnormalities that are not present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examination incomplete or lacking fluency or systematic approach</li> <li>Somewhat logical flow</li> <li>Errors made affect overall examination</li> <li>Misses signs, or finds some signs that are not present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertakes systematic examination satisfactorily, without unnecessary duplication</li> <li>Any mistakes are minor and do not affect the overall examination</li> <li>Detects all essential signs</li> <li>Does not find signs that are not present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent and accurate and examination completed within time allocated</li> <li>Logical flow with sense of purpose</li> <li>Demonstrates confidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent and accurate and examination completed within time allocated</li> <li>Makes adjustment to routine where appropriate</li> <li>Purposeful, integrated examination</li> </ul>
Knowledge and use of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No knowledge on the subject of the questions asked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little knowledge on the subject of the questions asked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some knowledge on the subject of the questions asked but not to the level commensurate with training</li> <li>Ability to provide some justification for their answers but not to relate this to the clinical evidence available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate knowledge for the level of training</li> <li>Ability to provide evidence to support their answers</li> <li>Ability to justify their answers using the clinical evidence available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good level of knowledge for the level of training</li> <li>Confident, accurate application of clinical evidence available to answer the question</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent level of knowledge for the level of training</li> </ul>
Clarity of clinical reasoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates no clinical reasoning</li> <li>Demonstrates no insight</li> <li>Fixed, false and harmful beliefs on the subject of the questions asked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear, muddled clinical reasoning</li> <li>Unable to provide coherent, consistent advice</li> <li>Provides advice that is contradictory and inconsistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates some clinical reasoning</li> <li>Provides advice that is consistent but incomplete</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate grasp of clinical situation presented</li> <li>Demonstrates sound clinical reasoning</li> <li>Provides advice that is accurate, consistent and complete</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected standard plus</li> <li>Provides advice that is appropriate to the context of the clinical scenario</li> <li>Provides advice that takes into consideration the patient or role player's individual needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better than expected standard plus</li> <li>Provides advice using language that is readily understandable to the patient or role player</li> <li>Checks for understanding from the patient or role player</li> </ul>