

Clinical Pathological Case (CPC) Competition

Judging Criteria & Resident Presentation Scoring

Name
Title
TOTAL SCORE

Area	Item	Options	Score
I. Differential Diagnosis			
A. History			
		Complete pertinent history provided	5
			4
		Partially complete history, no misleading information	3
			2
		Significant omissions or misleading information	1
B. Examination			
		Complete pertinent examination provided	5
			4
		Partially complete examination, no misleading information	3
			2
		Significant omissions or misleading information	1
C. Emergency Department course			
		Explained any unexpected evolution in the case or no unexpected changes during the ED course	3
			2
		Pertinent information is missing	1
II. Overall Oral/ Visual Presentation			
A. Quality of slides			
		Appropriate text and graphic size, easy to see pertinent information	5
			4
		Text too small or large, graphics blurry but discernable, challenging to see pertinent information	3
			2
		Exceedingly crowded text, unable to discern pertinent information from graphics	1

B. Oratory skills		
	Interesting to listen to, uses appropriate terminology	5
		4
	Somewhat monotonous, occasionally uses technical terms inappropriately	3
		2
	Extremely monotonous or frequent misuse of technical terms	1
C. Time management (separate from penalty for exceeding allowed time)		
	Appropriate pace and cadence	3
	Somewhat rushed or drawn out, advances slides somewhat fast	2
	Exceedingly rushed or drawn out, advances key slides too fast to obtain necessary information	1
III. Appropriate Studies Provided		
A. Data provided		
	Complete, appropriate studies provided	10
		9
		8
	Partial studies provided, key items present, no misleading information	7
		6
		5
	Partial studies provided, key items incomplete, no misleading information	4
		3
		2
	Incomplete studies interfering with making the diagnosis, intentionally misleading information is provided	1
B. Additional data		
	Resident adds pertinent withheld data in the summary and discussion	-2
	Resident did not withhold pertinent data	0

IV. Case Solvability/ Fairness		
A. Quality of case		
	High quality case, intriguing	5
		4
	Good case, interesting	3
		2
	Poor case, simple or straightforward diagnosis	1
B. Solvability		
	Challenging but solvable	5
		4
	Solvable	3
		2
	Not solvable or "give-away" diagnosis	1
C. Relevance to the practice of Emergency Medicine		
	Clearly demonstrated relevance to Emergency Medicine practice	3
		2
	Did not demonstrate relevance to Emergency Medicine practice	1
D. Final Diagnosis		
	Resident's rationale for the final diagnosis was well supported	5
		4
	Resident's rationale for the final diagnosis was not well supported or the Resident did not provide a rationale for the diagnosis but the Resident and Faculty agree on the diagnosis	3
		2
	Resident and Faculty disagree on the final diagnosis and the Faculty's rationale is superior to the Resident's	1

E. Fairness		
	Diagnosis can be made by reasoning with available information and without studies not routinely done or available in the ED	5
		4
	Studies are needed to make the diagnosis that are beyond the capability of the ED (e.g. PET scan, fungal culture, etc.)	3
		2
	Impossible to reasonably come to the diagnosis without additional information (e.g. findings only seen on post-mortem examination, tissue pathology, etc.)	1