Instructions for Rater:

- Read and grade each student response using the performance quality anchors of Excellent, Competent, Borderline, or Poor. Provide additional comments as desired. Your comments will be provided to the student.
- Complete the additional checklist for items 3 and 4 for students rated Borderline or Poor.

DXJ Grading Recommendations (Approved by Committee March 7, 2011)

- Two faculty raters will be used for each set of patient notes
- Three items: Differential Diagnosis, Recognition/Use of Findings, Thought Processes/Knowledge Utilization
- All 3 items to have equal point values. Total possible: 9 pts.
- DXJ to count for 20% of case grade.
1. **Differential:** Based on the diagnostic possibilities discussed did the student consider an appropriate range of diagnostic possibilities given the findings of the case?

   0 Poor  |  1 Borderline  |  2 Competent  |  3 Excellent

2. **Recognition and use of key findings (Pertinent positives and negatives alike) in building an argument for the final diagnosis**

   0 Poor  |  1 Borderline  |  2 Competent  |  3 Excellent

   **To be completed only for students rated poor or borderline in this section**

   - □ Some key findings not noted.
   - □ Student reported findings that were not present in this patient.
   - □ Failed to drill down sufficiently while collecting data to understand the patient’s problem
   - □ Student failed to recognize significance and/or meaning of some key findings.
   - □ Some key findings were misinterpreted.

3. **Thought Processes and Clinical Knowledge Utilization**

   0 Poor  |  1 Borderline  |  2 Competent  |  3 Excellent

   **To be completed only for students rated poor or borderline in this section**

   - □ No response or a response that just re-asserted the diagnosis without providing supporting evidence.
   - □ Organization reflects routine unfocused data collection rather than an active effort to link diagnostic models of disease and patient findings (functioned as a reporter rather than interpreter of findings)
   - □ Student was overly focused on defending a single diagnosis. Student failed to actively consider alternative explanations.
   - □ Response reflects a superficial analysis and/or an oversimplified understanding of the patient’s medical problems (Examples: Student used one or two pieces of information to support the diagnosis. Student failed to explicitly address disconfirming evidence. Student failed to explicitly address pertinent negatives).
   - □ Response reflects erroneous understanding of the constellation of findings associated with one or more diagnoses considered.
   - □ Failed to organize and summarize findings in a productive way
   - □ Conclusions that could be supported by data were not drawn
   - □ Available data contradict the student’s conclusions

**Comments:**
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