

**Professional Competencies Rating Scale – Physical Examination Station Sample**

ASSESSMENT DOMAINS	VERY POOR PERFORMANCE	WELL BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD	BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD	EXPECTED STANDARD	BETTER THAN EXPECTED STANDARD	EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE
	0 marks	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks	5 marks
<b>QUALITY AND SAFETY OF PHYSICAL EXAMINATION (EPA 4)*</b>  Physicians practice in a safe, high-quality manner within the limits of their expertise. Document physical examination findings and synthesise with clarity and completeness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot perform appropriate examination of system</li> <li>No clear structure</li> <li>Makes multiple mistakes</li> <li>Unable to coherently synthesise findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many key components of examination poorly performed or not completed</li> <li>Minimal structure with disorganised approach</li> <li>Major mistakes are made that would clearly affect diagnostic decision making</li> <li>Misses essential signs or finds major abnormalities that are not present</li> <li>Experiences significant difficulty with coherent synthesis of findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some key components of examination poorly performed or not completed</li> <li>May not consider potential safety risks to patient</li> <li>Lacks fluency or systematic approach</li> <li>Mistakes would have some impact on diagnostic decision making</li> <li>Misses some important signs or finds some signs that are not present</li> <li>Able to coherently present simple findings, but lacks clarity overall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertakes systematic and safe examination, without unnecessary duplication</li> <li>Clear structure to examination technique</li> <li>Any mistakes were minor and did not affect the overall examination</li> <li>Detects the majority of essential signs</li> <li>Does not find signs that are not present</li> <li>Able to coherently present examination findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent, accurate and timely examination</li> <li>Logical flow with sense of purpose</li> <li>Demonstrates confidence</li> <li>Demonstrates self-awareness of any errors and corrects</li> <li>All essential signs are clearly demonstrated</li> <li>Coherent and logical presentation with some synthesis of findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent, accurate and within time</li> <li>Makes adjustment to routine where appropriate</li> <li>Purposeful, integrated examination</li> <li>All signs are expertly demonstrated</li> <li>Able to succinctly present information and synthesise findings</li> </ul>
<b>COMMUNICATION (EPA 4 &amp; 7)</b>  Physicians collate information, and share this information clearly, accurately, respectfully, responsibly, empathetically and in a manner that is understandable to patients, families, carers, and professionals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanations not organised or inappropriate</li> <li>Dismissive of communication partner</li> <li>Very poor non-verbal communication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanations difficult to follow and understand, very poorly organised</li> <li>Frequent inaccuracies in information provided</li> <li>Frequent use of jargon without explanation</li> <li>Poor non-verbal communication with limited eye contact or poor body language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some structure to explanation but overall difficult to follow or understand</li> <li>Some inaccuracies in key components of explanations</li> <li>Used jargon/inappropriate terminology without explanation too often</li> <li>Instances of poor non-verbal communication, lack of empathy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information provided is mostly correct and presented clearly</li> <li>Minimal inaccuracies</li> <li>Used appropriate terminology most of the time</li> <li>Checked for understanding</li> <li>Appropriate non-verbal communication</li> <li>Candidates use collaborative, effective, respectful, and empathetic communication with patients, families, carers and professionals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided organised, clear explanation to questions</li> <li>Used appropriate terminology</li> <li>Evidence of active listening skills</li> <li>Clearly demonstrated empathy and respect for communication partner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided well organised, clear and detailed explanations and answers</li> <li>Confident and skilful at giving information</li> <li>Uses a broad range of verbal and non-verbal skills including active listening</li> <li>Attentive to communication partner, consistently checked for understanding</li> </ul>

ASSESSMENT DOMAINS	VERY POOR PERFORMANCE	WELL BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD	BELOW EXPECTED STANDARD	EXPECTED STANDARD	BETTER THAN EXPECTED STANDARD	EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE
	0 marks	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks	5 marks
<b>JUDGEMENT AND DECISION MAKING</b>  Physicians collect and interpret information, and evaluate and synthesise evidence, to make the best possible decisions in their practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates very poor diagnostic reasoning</li> <li>• Makes poor or unsafe decisions</li> <li>• Fixed, false and harmful beliefs on the subject of the questions asked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear, illogical diagnostic reasoning</li> <li>• Evidence of inaccurate or potentially unsafe decisions</li> <li>• Unable to provide coherent, consistent advice, that may be contradictory</li> <li>• Does not recognise own limitations, demonstrates poor judgement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some diagnostic reasoning, but lacks logic at times</li> <li>• Some safety concerns identified</li> <li>• Provides advice that is consistent but incomplete</li> <li>• Lacks confidence in decision making or concerns about judgement identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound diagnostic decision making</li> <li>• No significant safety concerns identified</li> <li>• Provides advice that is accurate, consistent and complete</li> <li>• Applies good judgement and has confidence in opinions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates clear and logical diagnostic decision making the majority of the time</li> <li>• No safety concerns identified</li> <li>• Advice is tailored to the context of the clinical scenario</li> <li>• Applies good judgement that takes into consideration the patient or role player's individual needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates excellent diagnostic decision with high degree of logic and understanding</li> <li>• No safety concerns identified</li> <li>• Provides advice using language that is readily understandable to the patient or role player</li> <li>• High level of judgement demonstrated with consideration of all important factors</li> </ul>
<b>MEDICAL EXPERTISE</b>  Physicians apply knowledge and skills informed by best available current evidence in the delivery of high-quality, safe practice to facilitate agreed health outcomes for individual patients and populations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor level of requisite knowledge, unaware of most key details</li> <li>• Management plan is unsafe, or harmful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large gaps in requisite knowledge, aware of very basic details only</li> <li>• Unable to generate a reasonable list of differential diagnoses</li> <li>• Management plan is poorly developed, lacks most important details</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates important gaps/errors in requisite knowledge</li> <li>• Has difficulty with differential diagnosis, misses important conditions</li> <li>• Management plan outlined has errors, omissions or is poorly constructed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a sound level of requisite knowledge</li> <li>• Able to generate a reasonable list of differential diagnoses, most important conditions covered</li> <li>• Able to outline an adequate management plan, with only minor errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates detailed understanding of requisite knowledge</li> <li>• Detailed list of differential diagnoses with some evidence of ability to prioritise</li> <li>• Able to outline an organised, logical management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a very high level of requisite knowledge</li> <li>• Detailed list of differential diagnoses with comprehensive applicability to context</li> <li>• Able to outline a highly developed, well-structured management plan</li> </ul>