

# The Royal College of Ophthalmologists

17 Cornwall Terrace, London. NW1 4QW.

Telephone: 020-7935 0702, Extension 210

Facsimile: 020-7487 4674

Email: Emily.Beet@rcophth.ac.uk

Website: [www.rcophth.ac.uk](http://www.rcophth.ac.uk)



PATRON HRH THE DUKE OF YORK, KCVO, ADC

FROM THE EXAMINATIONS DEPARTMENT

## Public Report on the Part 2 FRCOphth Written Examination September 2013

### Contents

Summary	Page 2
MCQ paper	
Content (Blueprint)	Page 3
Statistics	Page 4
Distribution of scores	Page 4
Standard setting	Page 5
Breakdown of results	Page 5
Comparison to previous Part 2 written examinations	Page 7
Appendix 1	
Hofstee pass mark	Page 8

## **Public report on the Part 2 FRCOphth examination**

The written paper of the eleventh sitting of the Part 2 FRCOphth examination was held on Monday 9 September 2013.

### **Summary**

Since the change of the format of the written examination to a single 180 question multiple choice paper, the reliability has increased to an acceptable standard (KR 0.8).

The pass rate for the examination was very high (93%) with a pass mark that was slightly lower (59% vs 61%) than the last sitting.

The examination attracts candidates who are not in training posts in the UK (29/103) but they do not perform quite as well as those in OST. For this sitting of the Part 2 FRCOphth Written Paper, the pass rate for candidates in OST was 67/69 (97%) compared to 29/34 (85%) for candidates who are not in OST. This provides some evidence to support the examination as a valid assessment of OST.

There were no significant differences in the performance of candidates based upon gender, ethnicity, first language or country of qualification.

### **The candidates**

103 candidates presented themselves for the examination.

### **The written paper**

The written component of the Part 2 FRCOphth examination consists of a multiple choice question paper, which is administered in two parts as two 2-hour, 90-question single best answer from four MCQ papers. Candidates must pass the written paper to be allowed to sit the oral component of the examination.

As part of the quality management of the College's assessment process, the written papers are reviewed by the Senior Examiner after marking, but before the results are known. Two questions were removed from the examination papers as a result of this review.


The Part 2 FRCOphth Sub-Committee reviews all of the questions with negative 33% item discrimination and low facility.

# The MCQ paper blueprint

Table 1

		September 2013
<b>Basic science</b>		<b>8</b>
	Anatomy & physiology	2
	Pathology & microbiology	2
	Optics	1
	Genetics	3
<b>Clinical ophthalmology</b>		<b>126</b>
	Cataract*	9
	Neurology & pupils	16
	Glaucoma	10
	Strabismus	8
	Paediatrics	8
	Retina*	19
	Uveitis & oncology	12
	Oculoplastics and orbit	10
	Cornea & external eye	20
	Trauma	4
	Medicine	10
<b>Management &amp; therapeutics</b>	<b>Pharmacology &amp; therapeutics</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Investigations</b>		<b>16</b>
	Ophthalmic	9
	Orthoptic	3
	Neuroimaging	3
	Other	1
<b>Miscellaneous</b>		<b>16</b>
	Statistics & epidemiology	3
	EBM and research	3
	Medicolegal/Ethics	4
	Health economics	1
	Nutrition	1
	Guidelines	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>178</b>

Two questions were removed before the calculation of the results



## MCQ paper statistics:

Mean score:	124/178	(69.4%)
Median score:	125/178	(70.2%)
Standard deviation:	12.6	(7%)
Candidates:	103	
KR20: (measurement of reliability)	0.82	
Standard error of measurement (SEM):	5.34	(%)
Range of marks:	90 to 149	(51% to 84%)
Pass mark derived from Standard Setting:	104/178	(59%)

**Pass rate: 96/103 (93%)**

**Table 2** Distribution of marks:

Score	Distribution	Total
86-90	/	1
91-95	/	1
96-100	//	2
101-105	/// //	7
106-110	////	5
111-115	//// // /	11
116-120	//// //	7
121-125	//// // // //	19
126-130	//// // // //	18
131-135	//// // // // /	16
136-140	//// //	10
141-145	///	3
146-150	///	3
151-155		0
Total		

## Analysis of questions

The Speedwell data provides analysis and identification of easy, moderate and difficult questions, and those, which are good, poor or perverse (negative) discriminators. Ideally all questions should be moderate and good.

**Table 3**

	Difficult (<25 correct)	Moderate (25-74) Correct)	Easy (>75 correct)	Total
Negative discrimination	1	7	4	12
Poor discrimination (0-0.19)	4	31	63	98
Good discrimination (0.2-0.5)	2	45	21	68
Total	7	83	88	178

## Standard setting for MCQ paper (Ebel method)

Table 4: Classification of the questions:

	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	
Essential	0	12	49	61
Important	6	21	53	80
Supplementary	6	9	22	37
Total	12	42	124	178

Table 5: Percentage correct by borderline candidates

	Difficult	Moderate	Easy
Essential	0.6	0.7	0.8
Important	0.5	0.55	0.6
Supplementary	0.25	0.3	0.3

Table 6: Weighted score

	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	
Essential	0	8.4	39.2	47.6
Important	3	11.55	31.8	46.35
Supplementary	1.5	2.7	6.6	10.8
Total	4.5	22.65	77.6	104.75

**MCQ pass mark: 104/178 (59%)**

### Breakdown of Written Results

Table 7 Breakdown of written results by training

	Failed	Passed	Total
In OST	2	67	69
Not in OST	5	29	34
Total	7	96	103

These differences are statistically significant  
( $p = 0.037$  Fisher exact probability test)

**Table 8 Breakdown of written results by stage of training**

	Failed	Passed	Total
ST3	0	0	0
ST4	0	9	9
ST5	1	18	19
ST6	0	22	22
ST7	1	15	16
	2	64	66

\* Stage of training unknown for 3 candidates

Table 9 Breakdown of results by deanery

	Failed	Passed	Total
East Midlands	0	5	5
East of England	1	2	3
East of Scotland	0	0	0
London KSS	0	15	15
Mersey	0	6	6
North of Scotland	0	0	0

North Western	0	3	3
Northern	0	3	3
N Ireland	0	3	3
Oxford	0	3	3
Peninsula	0	5	5
Severn	0	0	0
South of Scotland	0	1	1
Wales	0	3	3
Wessex	0	0	0
West Midlands	0	8	8
West of Scotland	0	5	5
Yorkshire	1	5	6
TOTAL	2	67	69

Table 10 Breakdown of written results by gender

	Failed	Passed	Total
Female	2	32	34
Male	5	64	69
Total	7	96	103

These differences are not statistically significant ( $p = 1$  Fisher exact probability test)

Table 11 Breakdown of written results by country of qualification

	Failed	Passed	Total
UK	4	49	53
Outside UK (Inc Republic of Ireland)	3	47	50
Total	7	96	103

These differences are not statistically significant ( $p = 1$  Fisher exact probability test)

Table 12 Breakdown of written results by stated ethnicity

	Failed	Passed	Total
Non-white	6 (3)	67 (30)	73 (33)
White	1 (1)	25 (16)	26 (17)
Total	7 (4)	92 (46)	99 (50)

Ethnicity not stated by 4 candidates (UK graduates)

These differences are not statistically significant for white/non-white ( $p = 0.67$  Fisher exact probability test)

Table 13 Breakdown of written results by first language

	Failed	Passed	Total
English	3	62	65
Other	4	25	29
Total	7	87	94

\*First language unknown for 9 candidates

These differences are not statistically significant ( $p = 0.197$  Fisher exact probability test)

**Table 14 Breakdown of results by number of attempts**

Attempt	Failed	Passed	Total	Pass rate
1 (first)	4	48	52	92
2	2	28	30	93
3	1	9	10	90
4	0	5	5	100
5	0	5	5	100
6	0	0	0	0
7	0	1	1	100
Any re-attempt	3	48	51	94

**Comparison with the written papers from previous examinations**

**Table 15**

Examination	Candidates	Pass mark	Pass rate
September 2008	7	63%	86%
February 2009	15	59%	53%
September 2009	16	61%	38%
February 2010	21	65%	48%
September 2010	26	65%	58%
February 2011	46	65%	46%
September 2011	77	59%	68%
February 2012	104	58%	65%
September 2012	95	57%	81%
February 2013	109	61%	85%
September 2013	103	59%	93%

Michael Nelson BSc (Hons) FRCOphth MAEd  
**Education Advisor**

October 2013

## Appendix 1 Hofstee pass mark

As a comparison to the pass mark identified using the Ebel method, the pass mark identified using the Hofstee method illustrated below:

Maximum fail rate	50%	
(Minimum pass rate	(50%)	
Minimum fail rate	20%	
(Maximum pass rate	(80%)	
Maximum pass mark	65%	(116/178)
Minimum pass mark	50%	(89/178)

(These values have been identified by the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Part 2 sub-committee)

Hofstee pass mark	114/178	(64%)
Pass rate with Hofstee pass mark	81/103	(78%)

*This pass mark is higher than the pass mark identified using the Ebel method.*

