Update: AMC WBA Results Sub-Group

Richard Doherty

Outgoing Chair, AMC Results Sub-Group

Chair, AMC Board of Examiners

Australian Medical Council Limited

Scope of the Results Sub-Group

- To ratify and confirm candidate results
- Routine procedures:
  - Confirm candidate assessments are completed as per accredited blue print
  - Review all marks and comments to ensure findings are consistent
  - Verify assessments to ensure that minimum required standards are achieved
- Regular review: 5 meetings in 2012; 3 meetings to date in 2013
- Provide feedback to Interim Accreditation Committee and providers as required

Membership

- Panel members include:
  - Chair: Chair of BOE
  - Chair IAC
  - Other members
    - Senior Medicine Examiner: Barry McGrath
    - Senior Women's Health Examiner: Ross Sweet
    - Senior Psychiatry Examiner: Frank Hume
    - Senior Paediatrics Examiner: Peter Vine
    - Senior Surgical Examiner: Tony Buzzard/Peter Devitt

- Professor Kichu Nair AM appointed May 2013 to Chair Results Panel

Positive feedback from Group

- Standard of the documentation is generally high
- Wide-range of clinical skills and cases are being assessed
- Assessments are completed within the time-frame set out and often in advance of deadlines
- Indirect methods like MSF and supervisor reports are important tools in assessing the across dimensions Eg. ability to work as effective member of healthcare team

Feedback on issues noted: 1

- Perceived confusion about the use/purpose of the Mini-CEX and CBDs, which includes:
  - The clinical problem to be assessed
  - The assessment domains required to be marked
- Presenting problem needs to be clearly defined to reflect what is actually being assessed
- Wide range of DOPS's:
  - physical examinations are exams NOT procedures
- Notable variety in assessment tools utilised

Feedback on issues noted :2

- Need to ensure that data complete before submission to meeting
  - Rapid uploading of data has been effective to remedy this, but only possible at low throughput
- Ensure all fields on forms are completed, including comments and assessor identity
  - Qualitative comments are extremely valuable in reviewing marginal or borderline performance
  - Role and level of appointment of assessor is valuable for interpretation

Potential concerns to be watched

- Tendency to regress to examination mode:
  - Original intent is to assess performance
  - How do we convince assessors and candidates of this?
- Need to ensure standard of assessment is consistent and appropriate
- Potential for leakage of paper CBD's
- Need for better documentation of issues arising in Mini-CEX and CBD's
- Need for role and position of reviewers to be defined in MSF
  - Glowing reports from inappropriate reviewers are not helpful

Update from Group

- Manual process initiated for processing and record keeping of results for WBA candidates
  - *Thank you to providers for your patience*
  - When program assessment plan evolves, the plan applicable to each candidate must be clear for Results Group
- Individualised assessment blueprint for each candidate required for Group to consider with results
- *Sample draft blueprint available in discussion paper – comments welcomed*

Conclusion

- Steady number of candidates being verified by the Result Sub-Group on a regular basis
- Result review has informed improvements to WBA process
- Thanks to providers for working to meet AMC assessment requirements in an evolving process
- Major challenge to ensure principles not sacrificed