**ORAL CASE PESENTATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

**MEDICINE 251 – INTEGRATED CLINICAL CLERKSHIP IN MEDICINE II**

**Name of Student:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Diagnosis and List of Differentials (20 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | 6 | 8 | | | | 10 | | 12 | | 14 | | 16 | | | 18 | | 20 | |
| Clinical impression illogical,  Important differentials lacking  or were illogical and incomplete | | | | | | | | | Clinical impression followed some logic, some important differentials  lacking or illogical | | | | Clinical impression was logically  based on appropriate history and  PE details, differential diagnoses  were complete & logical | | | | | | | |
| **Sufficiency of Basis for Diagnosis and Differentials (15 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 6 | | | 8 | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | | 13 | | | | | 15 |
| Pertinent information from the case (history, PE, labs) were not identified or were misinterpreted | | | | | | Some pertinent information from the case (history, PE, labs) were identified to support the differentials being considered, some pertinent information were missed | | | | | | | | | | All pertinent information from the case (history, PE, labs) were identified and was used to support the differentials being considered | | | | |
| **Problem List (15 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 6 | | | 8 | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | | 13 | | | | | 15 |
| Problem list was incomplete, illogical and with improper prioritization | | | | | | Problem list had prioritization but some problems were not identified or not properly clustered | | | | | | | | | | Problem list was complete, clustered, and prioritized | | | | |
| **Pathophysiologic Correlation (15 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 6 | | | 8 | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | | 13 | | | | | 15 |
| Clinicopathologic correlation  was not logical & presented  in a disorganized manner | | | | | | Clinicopathophysiologic  correlation was adequate  but lacked some organization | | | | | | | | | | Clinicopathologic correlation  was rational & presented  in an organized manner | | | | |
| **Diagnostic Plan (15 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 6 | | | 8 | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | | 13 | | | | | 15 |
| Diagnostic plan was  Irrational & not cost-  effective; presentation  was disorganized & lacked  relevant modalities &  evidence as basis | | | | | | Diagnostic plan was some-what rational, cost-effective, & presentation had some organization but lacked some relevant modalities & evidence as basis | | | | | | | | | | Diagnostic plan was  rational, cost-effective  & presented in an  organized, evidence-based  & comprehensive  manner | | | | |
| **Therapeutic Plan (15 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 6 | | | 8 | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | | 13 | | | | | 15 |
| Therapeutic plan was  Irrational & not cost-  effective; presentation  was disorganized & lacked  relevant modalities &  evidence as basis | | | | | | Therapeutic plan was some-what rational, cost-effective, & presentation had some organization but lacked some relevant modalities & evidence as basis | | | | | | | | | | Therapeutic plan was  rational, cost-effective  & presented in an  organized, evidence-based  & comprehensive  manner | | | | |
| **Professional Communication and Etiquette (5 points)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | 2 | | | | | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | | 5 | | | |
| Presentation was not  clear, and disorganized  Uses language that are unlikely to be understood in a medical/scientific presentation  Ideas or explanations are disproportionately lengthy and are difficult to follow  Language choices are vague, abstract, or trite  Incorrect use of terminology | | | | | | | | | Presentation was somewhat organized  Uses general vocabulary and tends to express ideas wordily  Although correct, terminology and language might not be equally understandable for listeners or appropriate for the setting | | | | Presentation was very  clear, concise & organized  Terminology and syntax are purposefully chosen to make a point  Uses language that is easily understood  Defines or clearly explains language or concepts that might be unfamiliar to others; the student knows when such explanations might be necessary | | | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |

Reminders for Faculty:

1. This is for **INDIVIDUAL SUMMATIVE** evaluation of students.
2. Minimum pass level for each category is 70%.
3. Minimum pass level for total score is 70%.
4. Remember that the rubric acts as a guide. You may give a numeric grade that is not in the exact guide point if it is within the range for the category. (e.g. For diagnosis and differentials, grade range is 1 to 20. Minimum pass level is 14. You may want to give a score of 17 if student is above satisfactory for passing level but is not at exemplary level).