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# Introduction

There were 37 candidates for the July 2019 sitting of the Refraction Certificate. The examination consisted of 10 objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) stations, covering a range of skills required to assess visual acuity, refractive error and the prescription of spectacles.

## Examination blueprint

The Refraction Certificate (RCert) is designed to assess the following learning outcomes from the Royal College of Ophthalmologists curriculum for ophthalmic specialist training (OST):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CA2 | Vision |
| CA7 | Motility |
| PM1 | Management plan |
| PM14 | Spectacles |
| PS2 | Refraction |
| PS21 | Hand hygiene |
| C1 | Rapport |
| C2 | Communication |
| C12 | Records |
| BCS6 | Optics |
| BCS14 | Instrument technology |
| AER16 | Time management |

## Examination structure

The examination consists of 10 OSCE stations. Each station contributes 15 marks to the overall total. The stations used for the examination were:

1. Cycloplegic retinoscopy (CR1)
2. Cycloplegic retinoscopy (CR2)
3. Cycloplegic retinoscopy (CR3)
4. Cycloplegic retinoscopy (CR4)
5. Non cycloplegic retinoscopy (NCR1)
6. Non cycloplegic retinoscopy (NCR2)
7. Subjective refraction sphere (SRS)
8. Binocular balance (BB)
9. Subjective refraction cylinder (SRC)
10. Lens neutralisation (LN)

# Summary

This sitting of the refraction certificate had 10 OSCE stations. The reliability of the examination is above the desired acceptable level (Cronbach's alpha 0.81, desired level >0.8).

The Hofstee method of standard setting was used to identify the pass mark for this examination, which was 106.5/150 (71 per cent). One station achieved high mean scores, station 2. The station with the lowest mean score was station 10. The pass rate was 62.16 per cent.

# Standard setting

Candidates must be able to accurately assess visual acuity, measure refractive error and recommend an appropriate spectacle correction to pass the RCert. The pass mark is identified using the Hofstee method.

## Hofstee method

After the examination, examiners were asked to review the parameters for the standard setting based upon their judgment of the difficulty of the stations. The following values were used to set the pass mark:

* The maximum credible pass mark for the examination = 75 per cent
* The maximum credible pass rate for the examination = 70 per cent
* The minimum credible pass mark for the examination = 60 per cent
* The minimum credible pass rate for the examination = 30 per cent

The cumulative fail rate as a function of the pass mark and the co-ordinates derived from the four values above were plotted on a graph. The point where a line joining the two coordinates intersects the cumulative function curve is used to identify the pass mark.

The Hofstee pass mark for this examination was 106.5/150 (71 per cent).

# Results

1. Results summary

| **Statistic** | **Value** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of candidates | 37 |  |
| Maximum possible mark | 150 |  |
| Mean candidate mark | 104.81 | 69.9% |
| Median candidate mark | 110.00 | 73.3% |
| Standard deviation | 23.77 | 15.8% |
| Highest candidate mark | 137 | 91.3% |
| Lowest candidate mark | 47 | 31.3% |
| Reliability | 0.81 |  |
| Standard error of measurement (SEM) | 10.27 | 6.8% |
| Hofstee pass mark | 106.5/150 | 71.0% |
| Pass Rate | 23/37 | 62.2% |



1. Distribution of marks

The vertical line denotes the point on the mark distribution where the pass mark lies.

1. Station summary

| **Station** | **Category**  | **Mean** | **Median** | **Standard deviation** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | CR1 | 11.49 | 12.00 | 2.88 | 4 | 15 |
| 2 | CR2 | 12.51 | 14.00 | 3.46 | 0 | 15 |
| 3 | CR3 | 12.00 | 13.00 | 3.60 | 3 | 15 |
| 4 | CR4 |  9.65 |  9.00 | 4.20 | 1 | 15 |
| 5 | NR1 | 10.49 | 12.00 | 4.62 | 1 | 15 |
| 6 | NR2 | 10.92 | 13.00 | 4.54 | 1 | 15 |
| 7 | SRS |  9.97 | 10.00 | 3.15 | 3 | 14 |
| 8 | BB |  9.32 | 10.00 | 4.09 | 0 | 15 |
| 9 | SRC |  9.24 | 10.00 | 4.15 | 2 | 15 |
| 10 | LN |  9.22 | 10.00 | 3.85 | 0 | 15 |

The relative weights for each skill in refraction (based upon the number of stations) are shown in table 3 below

1. Weights for each skill

| **Clinical Skill** | **Number of stations** | **Contribution to total marks** | **Median mark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Retinoscopy | 6 | 60% | 13 |
| Subjective | 3 | 30% | 10 |
| Other | 1 | 10% | 10 |

1. Correlation between stations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CR1** | **CR2** | **CR3** | **CR4** | **NR1** | **NR2** | **SRS** | **BB** | **SRC** |
| **CR2** | 0.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CR3** | 0.39 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CR4** | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **NR1** | 0.32 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **NR2** | 0.29 | 0.58 | 0.44 | 0.23 | 0.82 |  |  |  |  |
| **SRS** | 0.07 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.40 |  |  |  |
| **BB** | -0.14 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.72 |  |  |
| **SRC** | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.34 | 0.25 |  |
| **LN** | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.32 | 0.15 | 0.48 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.34 | 0.49 |

The median correlation between the cycloplegic refraction stations was 0.4.

There was moderate correlation between the following pairs of cycloplegic refraction stations: CR1 and CR2, CR1 and CR3, CR1 and CR4, CR2 and CR3, CR2 and CR4, CR3 and CR4.

The median correlation between the non-cycloplegic refraction stations was 0.82.

The best correlation was between station NR1 and NR2 (0.82).

The poorest correlation between any pair of stations was -0.14. All negative correlations are highlighted in red.

1. Correlation between each station and the total score

| **Station** | **CR1** | **CR2** | **CR3** | **CR4** | **NR1** | **NR2** | **SRS** | **BB** | **SRC** | **LN** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Correlation with total score | 0.45 | 0.56 | 0.69 | 0.53 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.63 |

# Breakdown of results

1. Breakdown of results by number of previous attempts

| **Sitting Attempt** | **Failed** | **Passed** | **Pass rate (%)** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 10 | 17 |  63.0 | 27 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 |  66.7 | 6 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 |  0.0 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 |  0.0 | 1 |
| **Total** | **14** | **23** |  **62.2** | **37** |

# Comparison to previous examinations

1. Comparison to previous years' exams

| **Date** | **Candidates** | **Pass mark** | **Pass rate** | **Pass rate in OST** | **Per cent of candidates in OST** | **Reliability** | **SEM** | **Hofstee pass mark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nov 2010   | 53 | 74% | 42% | 44% | 68% | 0.6 | 7 (7%) | 71% |
| Apr 2011   | 57 | 71% | 35% | 47% | 63% | 0.6 | 6 (6%) | 67% |
| Jul 2011   | 41 | 67% | 66% | 72% | 71% | 0.4 | 6 (6%) | 71% |
| Nov 2011   | 69 | 65% | 71% | 75% | 70% | 0.6 | 8 (8%) | 68% |
| Mar 2012   | 54 | 73% | 54% | 66% | 57% | 0.6 | 8 (8%) | 72% |
| Jul 2012   | 44 | 71% | 59% | 67% | 64% | 0.5 | 9 (9%) | 71% |
| Dec 2012\* | 71 | 69% | 75% | 77% | 55% | 0.6 | 11 (6%) | 72% |
| Apr 2013   | 64 | 74% | 61% | 64% | 64% | 0.8 | 11 (6%) | 74% |
| Jul 2013   | 42 | 72% | 74% | 90% | 48% | 0.7 | 10 (6%) | 74% |
| Dec 2013   | 75 | 72% | 67% | 76% | 65% | 0.7 | 10 (6%) | 71% |
| Apr 2014   | 56 | 73% | 84% | 89% | 66% | 0.6 | 9.5 (5%) | 75% |
| Jul 2014   | 34 | 74% | 62% | 55% | 65% | 0.4 | 11 (6%) | 74% |
| Dec 2014\* | 63 | 71% | 68% | 77% | 68% | 0.6 | 12 (7%) | 71% |
| Apr 2015\* | 57 | 77% | 65% | 73% | 65% | 0.4 | 11 (7%) | 77% |
| Jun 2015\* | 33 | 69% | 58% | n/a^ | n/a^ | 0.73 | 10 (6%) | 69% |
| Jul 2015\* | 31 | 66% | 58% | 55% | 65% | 0.65 | 9.4 (5%) | 66% |
| Jan 2016\* | 70 | 70% | 60% | 60% | 81% | 0.8 | 10 (6%) | 70% |
| Mar 2016\* | 57 | 77% | 81% | 83% | 70% | 0.9 | 7.7 (4%) | 77% |
| Jun 2016\* | 23 | 70% | 57% | n/a^ | n/a^ | 0.7 | 11 (6%) | 70% |
| Jul 2016\* | 64 | 70% | 64% | 67% | 67% | 0.6 | 12 (7%) | 70% |
| Jan 2017\* | 62 | 72% | 63% | 64% | 90% | 0.6 | 10 (6%) | 72% |
| Apr 2017\* | 63 | 73% | 67% | 69% | 62% | 0.7 | 11 (6%) | 73% |
| Jul 2017\* | 62 | 72% | 38% | 68% | 60% | 0.7 | 12 (6%) | 72% |
| Dec 2017\* | 63 | 71% | 35% | 59% | 65% | 0.72 | 11 (6%) | 71% |
| Apr 2018\* | 60 | 75% | 41% | 73% | 75% | 0.55 | 10 (6%) | 75% |
| Jun 2018\* | 39 | 75% | 29% | n/a^ | n/a^ | 0.69 | 10 (5%) | 75% |
| Jul 2018\* | 64 | 75% | 43% | 77% | 55% | 0.74 | 11 (6%) | 75% |
| Dec 2018\* | 68 | 72% | 37% | 70% | 63% | 0.7 | 11 (6%) | 72% |
| Apr 2019\* | 87 | 72% | 51% | 68% | 51% | 0.54 | 12 (6%) | 72% |
| Jun 2019\* | 40 | 70% | 23% | n/a | n/a | 0.73 | 11 (7%) | 70% |
| Jun 2019\* | 52 | 74% | 34% | n/a^ | n/a^ | 0.76 | 9 (6%) | 74% |
| Jul 2019\* | 37 | 71% | 23% | n/a | n/a | 0.81 | 10 (7%) | 71% |
| \* Hofstee pass mark used for these examinations ^ Examination held in Kuching, Malaysia |