## Examination Report

## May 2017 Part 1 FRCOphth Examination

## Contents:

Summary ..... page 2
MCQ paper
Content page 3
Statistics ..... page 3
Distribution of scores ..... page 3
Quality of questions page 4
Standard setting ..... page 4
Comparison to previous papers ..... page 5
CRQ paper
Content
page 6
Statistics ..... page 6
Distribution of scores ..... page 6
Marks for each question ..... page 7
Standard setting ..... page 8
Comparison to previous papers page 8
Overall results ..... page 9
Comparison to previous Part 1 examinations ..... page 10
Breakdown of results ..... page 11
Appendix 1 (results by deanery) ..... page 13

## Summary

The 33rd Part 1 FRCOphth examination took place on 08 May 2017. 136 candidates sat the examination, of whom 62 ( $46 \%$ ) fulfilled the criteria required to pass the examination overall. The pass rate is higher than January 2017 (38\%) and has returned to a more usual pass rate in recent sittings at around $50 \%$.

The pass rate for candidates in OST is $52 \%$ compared to a $42 \%$ pass rate for nontrainees. Eight Foundation trainees sat the examination and two (25\%) were successful. All the remaining candidates were either ST1 or ST2. The pass rates in ST1 were $55 \%$ and ST2 were $47 \%$.

Both examinations were reliable (0.92) and were reasonably correlated (0.76).
One question was removed from the MCQ paper after marking because it was felt to be ambiguous. The pass rate for the MCQ paper was $33 \%$, which is lower than that of May 2016 (58\%).

In past sittings candidates have performed poorly on the Optics questions. This time showed the lowest scores for the lacrimal tumour (Pathology Q2) and electrooculogram (Investigation Q8) questions. The pass rate for the CRQ was $67 \%$ which is a massive improvement on the last two exams and is actually one of the highest pass rates documented for this paper.

## MCQ examination

## Content (Table 1)

| Topic | Oct <br> 2014 | Jan <br> 2015 | May <br> 2015 | Oct <br> 2015 | Jan <br> 2016 | May <br> 2016 | Oct <br> 2016 | Jan <br> 2017 | May <br> 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anatomy/embryology | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Optics | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Pathology | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 23 |
| Pharmacology <br> genetics | $\&$ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physiology | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Miscellaneous <br> investigations | $\&$ | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MCQ paper statistics

| Mean score | 69 | $58 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median score | 69 | $58 \%$ |
| Standard deviation | 11.88 | $9.99 \%$ |
| Candidates | 136 |  |
| KR20: (measurement of reliability) | 0.8 |  |
| Standard error of measurement (SEM): | 5 | $4 \%$ |
| Range of marks | $36-93$ | $30 \%-78 \%$ |
| Pass mark derived from Standard Setting | $75 / 119$ | $63 \%$ |
| Pass mark - 1 SEM | $70 / 119$ | $59 \%$ |
| Pass rate | $45 / 136$ | $33 \%$ |

Distribution of results (Table 2)

| Range of scores | Distribution | Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-30$ |  | 0 |
| $31-40$ | $/ / /$ | 3 |
| $41-50$ | $/ / / / / / /$ | 7 |
| $51-60$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 27 |
| $61-70$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 37 |
| $71-80$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 35 |
| $81-90$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 25 |
| $91-100$ | $/ /$ | 2 |
| $101-120$ |  | 0 |
| Total |  | 136 |

## Quality of questions

The Speedwell data allows us to identify 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)

|  | Negative |  | Poor |  | Good |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <0 |  | 0-0.249 |  | >0.250 |  |  |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Total | \% |
| Difficult Facility<25\% | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Facility } & 25- \\ 75 \% & \end{array}$ | 1 | 1 | 45 | 38 | 43 | 36 | 89 | 75 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Easy } \\ & \text { Facility >75\% } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 18 |
| Total | 6 | 5 | 63 | 53 | 50 | 42 | 119 | 100 |

## Standard setting

The pass mark for the paper was agreed using the Ebel method.
(Table 4)

|  | Difficult | Moderate | Easy | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Essential | 0 | 37 | 44 | 81 |
| Important | 1 | 18 | 12 | 31 |
| Supplementary | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Total | 2 | 58 | 59 | 119 |

The Part 1 FRCOphth Sub-Committee considered the success of a minimally competent candidate in each category as below:
(Table 5)

|  | Difficult | Moderate | Easy |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Essential | 0.55 | 0.65 | 0.75 |  |
| Important | 0.45 | 0.5 | 0.55 |  |
| Supplementary | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

(Table 6)

|  | Difficult | Moderate | Easy | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Essential | 0 | 24.05 | 33 | 57.05 |
| Important | 0.45 | 9 | 6.6 | 16.05 |
| Supplementary | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 1.75 |
| TOTAL | 0.7 | 33.8 | 40.35 | 74.85 |

The MCQ pass mark $=\mathbf{7 5 / 1 1 9}$ (63\%)

## Comparison of pass marks and rates for last 8 MCQ papers (table 7)

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { May } \\ 14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct } \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Jan } \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { May } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { May } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { May } \\ 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Candidates | 119 | 232 | 89 | 114 | 188 | 107 | 123 | 194 | 101 | 136 |
| Mean score | 67 | 72 | 69 | 72 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 64 | 69 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Reliability } \\ \text { 20) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.88 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| SEM | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 |  | 4.8 |
| Standard setting | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel | Ebel |
| Pass mark | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & \text { (58\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & \text { (58\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & \text { (58\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \\ & (57 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & \text { (59\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & (63 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 33\% <br> discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 |  | 6 |
| Poor (0-0.249) | 43 | 40 | 56 | 47 | 59 | 55 | 34 | 49 |  | 63 |
| Good (>0.250) | 72 | 75 | 55 | 70 | 58 | 62 | 79 | 66 |  | 50 |
| Facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difficult (<25\%) | 6 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 9 |  | 8 |
| Moderate | 82 | 94 | 91 | 90 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 88 |  | 89 |
| Easy (>75\%) | 31 | 23 | 20 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 26 | 23 |  | 22 |
| Questions | 119 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 119 | 119 | 120 |  | 119 |
| Pass number (rate) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 54 \\ & (45 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 144 \\ & (62 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 53 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 73 \\ & (64 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 79 \\ & (42 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 47 \\ & (44 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 71 \\ & (58 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 72 \\ & (37 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 45 \\ & (33 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

## The CRQ paper

(Table 8)

| Question | Subject | Topic | Sub- <br> sections | Data provided |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Anatomy | Bones of the orbit | 4 | CT Scan image of orbit |
| 2 | Pathology | Lacrimal tumour | 6 | Photograph of <br> macroscopic biopsy <br> specimen and <br> histopathology slides |
| 3 | Pathology | Corneal pathogens | 8 | Low power image of <br> corneal tissue as seen <br> through a microscope |
| 4 | Optics* | Indirect Ophthalmoscope | 4 | None |
| 5 | Optics* | Prismatic effect of lenses | 5 | Picture of a Prism |
| 6 | Optics | Optical abberations | 6 | 3 ray diagram's |
| 7 | Optics* | Concave mirror | 4 | None |
| 8 | Investigations | Electro-oculogram | 6 | Graph showing <br> amplitudes measured <br> during an Electro- <br> oculogram |
| 9 | Investigations | Thyroid eye disease | 4 | Thyroid Function test <br> results are shown in a <br> table |
| 10 | Investigations | Visual Fields | 5 | Humphrey 24-2 field |
| 11 | Investigations | Genetics | Family Tree diagrams and <br> a chromosomal array |  |
| 12 | Statistics | Interpreting statistical <br> results in scientific papers | 5 | AJO extract of an <br> ophthalmology paper |

* Candidates are expected to draw a diagram as part of the answer


## Statistics

| Mean score | $68 / 120$ | $57 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median score | $70 / 120$ | $58 \%$ |
| Standard deviation | 31.2 | $26 \%$ |
| Candidates | 136 |  |
| Reliability: Cronbach alpha | 0.92 |  |
| Standard error of measurement (SEM): | 5 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Range of marks | $19-94$ | $16 \%-78 \%$ |
| Pass mark derived from Standard Setting | $64 / 120$ | $53 \%$ |
| Pass mark - 1 SEM | $59 / 120$ | $49 \%$ |
| Pass rate | $91 / 136$ | $67 \%$ |

Distribution of scores (Table 9)

| Range of marks | Distribution | Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0-30$ | $/ /$ | 2 |
| $31-40$ | $/ / / / / /$ | 6 |
| $41-50$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 15 |
| $51-60$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 15 |


| $61-70$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 32 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $71-80$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 35 |
| $81-90$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 24 |
| $91-100$ | $/ / / / / / /$ | 7 |
| $101-117$ |  | 0 |
| Total |  | 136 |

Two examiners marked each question in the CRQ papers and the average mark from each was used to produce the candidate mark. Each question has maximum possible 10 marks. Candidate performance was variable for each question, with mean, median, minimum and maximum scores (with standard deviations) of:
(Table 10) Results for each question

| Q | Subject | Mean | Median | Min | Max | SD | BCM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Anatomy | 7.1 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 1.24 | 5 |
| 2 | Pathology | 3.9 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1.75 | 5 |
| 3 | Pathology | 6.9 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 1.66 | 6 |
| 4 | Optics* | 4.8 | 4.5 | 0 | 10 | 2.52 | 5.5 |
| 5 | Optics | 5.5 | 5.5 | 0 | 10 | 2.47 | 5 |
| 6 | Optics | 6.8 | 7.5 | 0 | 10 | 2.47 | 5.75 |
| 7 | Optics* | 5.6 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 2.95 | 5.5 |
| 8 | Investigations | 3.6 | 3.5 | 0 | 8 | 2.39 | 5.5 |
| 9 | Investigations | 5.4 | 5.5 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.77 | 5 |
| 10 | Investigations | 6.3 | 6.5 | 0 | 10 | 2.01 | 6 |
| 11 | Investigations | 4.9 | 5 | 0.5 | 9 | 1.74 | 5 |
| 12 | Statistics | 6.7 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 2.41 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Candidates performed badly in or were particularly ill prepared for question 8 (investigations) and question 2 (pathology)

## Standard setting

The borderline candidate method was used to identify the pass mark for the CRQ. The examiners who marked the CRQ paper were asked to allocate a mark according to the marking scheme provided and, in addition, class the candidate's performance as a pass, fail or borderline. The sum of each median borderline mark was used to produce the pass mark:
(Table 11) Standard setting by each examiner

|  |  | Examiners A |  |  |  | Examiners B |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Topic | No. <br> Fail | No. <br> Border | No. <br> Pass | Median <br> Border | No. <br> Fail | No. <br> Border | No. <br> Pass | Median <br> Border |
| 1 | Anatomy | 4 | 9 | 123 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 122 | 5 |
| 2 | Pathology | 77 | 40 | 19 | 5 | 78 | 35 | 23 | 5 |
| 3 | Pathology | 19 | 30 | 87 | 6 | 25 | 16 | 95 | 6 |
| 4 | Optics | 54 | 44 | 38 | 6 | 78 | 19 | 39 | 5 |
| 5 | Optics | 41 | 45 | 50 | 5 | 44 | 36 | 56 | 5 |
| 6 | Optics | 18 | 37 | 81 | 5.5 | 23 | 26 | 87 | 6 |
| 7 | Optics | 40 | 22 | 74 | 5 | 35 | 22 | 79 | 6 |
| 8 | Investigations | 79 | 29 | 28 | 5 | 77 | 37 | 22 | 6 |
| 9 | Investigations | 33 | 62 | 41 | 5 | 32 | 53 | 51 | 5 |
| 10 | Investigations | 31 | 27 | 78 | 6 | 32 | 36 | 68 | 6 |
| 11 | Investigations | 53 | 40 | 43 | 5 | 54 | 41 | 41 | 5 |
| 12 | Statistics | 30 | 17 | 89 | 5 | 25 | 27 | 84 | 5 |
| Total |  | 479 | 402 | 751 | 63.5 | 507 | 358 | 767 | 65 |

Comparison to previous years (Table 12)

|  | Oct 14 | Jan 15 | May <br> $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Oct 15 | Jan 16 | May <br> $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Oct 16 | Jan 17 | May <br> $\mathbf{1 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean score | $50 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Median <br> score | $52 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Reliability | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| SEM | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 3 | 4.5 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Pass mark | $57 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Pass rate | $38 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Correlation <br> with MCQ | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.83 | $?$ | 0.76 |

The correlation between the two parts of the examination is acceptable at 0.76

## Overall Results

To pass the Part 1 FRCOphth examination candidates are required to:

1. Obtain a combined mark from both papers that equals or exceeds the combined pass marks obtained by the standard setting exercise explained above.
2. Obtain a mark in both papers that equals or exceeds the pass mark minus 1 standard error of measurement for each paper.

A candidate is therefore allowed to compensate a poor performance in one paper by a very good performance in the other paper. They cannot compensate for an extremely poor performance in one paper whatever the combined mark.

The minimum mark required in order to meet standard 1 above for this examination was 139/239 (58\%). The minimum mark required in each paper (to meet standard 2 above) was $75 / 119$ in the MCQ paper and $64 / 120$ in the CRQ paper.

Sixty-two candidates (46\%) gained a total mark that met standards 1 and 2 above. Eleven candidates achieved 139/239 or greater (139,139,139,139,140,143,145,146,146,151) but failed to achieve 75/119 in the MCQ paper (69,69,66,62,66,62,65,69,68,61,66)

62/136 (46\%) candidates passed the examination.

Distribution of scores (Table 13)

| Range of marks | Distribution | Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $<60$ | $/$ | 1 |
| $61-70$ | $/$ | 1 |
| $71-80$ | $/ /$ | 2 |
| $81-90$ | $/$ | 1 |
| $91-100$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / /$ | 11 |
| $101-110$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 5 |
| $111-120$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / /$ | 16 |
| $121-130$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 10 |
| $131-140$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 24 |
| $141-150$ | $/ / / / / / / / / / / / /$ | 25 |
| $151-160$ | $/ / / / / / / / / /$ | 14 |
| $161-170$ | $/$ | 14 |
| $171-180$ |  | 11 |
| $181-190$ |  | 1 |
| $191-200$ |  | 0 |
| Total |  | 136 |

Mean 137/239 (57\%)
Median 139/239 (58\%)
Range 59-181 ( $25 \%-76 \%$ )

Comparison to previous years: (Table 14)

| Examination | Candidates | Passed <br> examination | \% Passed | MCQ pass <br> mark \% | CRQ pass <br> mark \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oct 2006 | 33 | 3 | 9 | 58 | 62 |
| Jan 2007 | 24 | 4 | 16 | 60 | 43 |
| May 2007 | 32 | 5 | 15 | 50 | 64 |
| Oct 2007 | 56 | 13 | 23 | 51 | 59 |
| Jan 2008 | 73 | 27 | 37 | 56 | 55 |
| May 2008 | 66 | 16 | 24 | 57 | 48 |
| Oct 2008 | 88 | 45 | 51 | 58 | 51 |
| Jan 2009 | 79 | 37 | 47 | 61 | 57 |
| July 2009 | 49 | 33 | 67 | 63 | 58 |
| Oct 2009 | 101 | 56 | 56 | 62 | 56 |
| Jan 2010 | 50 | 20 | 40 | 63 | 58 |
| May 2010 | 79 | 31 | 39 | 60 | 57 |
| Oct 2010 | 89 | 34 | 38 | 61 | 54 |
| Jan 2011 | 62 | 23 | 37 | 59 | 58 |
| May 2011 | 95 | 47 | 49 | 54 | 57 |
| Oct 2011 | 122 | 63 | 52 | 56 | 56 |
| Jan 2012 | 66 | 20 | 33 | 57 | 54 |
| May 2012 | 104 | 53 | 51 | 56 | 58 |
| Oct 2012 | 150 | 84 | 56 | 56 | 54 |
| Jan 2013 | 91 | 47 | 52 | 57 | 53 |
| May 2013 | 102 | 54 | 53 | 58 | 58 |
| Oct 2013 | 151 | 65 | 43 | 58 | 60 |
| Jan 2014 | 77 | 23 | 30 | 57 | 57 |
| May 2014 | 119 | 55 | 46 | 58 | 56 |
| Oct 2014 | 232 | 102 | 44 | 58 | 57 |
| Jan 2015 | 89 | 50 | 56 | 58 | 61 |
| May 2015 | 114 | 62 | 54 | 57 | 54 |
| Oct 2015 | 188 | 57 | 30 | 59 | 59 |
| Jan 2016 | 107 | 36 | 34 | 59 | 54 |
| May 2016 | 123 | 61 | 50 | 60 | 56 |
| Oct 2016 | 194 | 70 | 36 | 60 | 59 |
| Jan 2017 | 101 | 38 | 38 | 60 | 51 |
| May 2017 | 136 | 62 | 46 | 63 | 53 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cumulative totals

| Sitting | Candidates | Number passed | Pass rate (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| January | 819 | 325 | 40 |
| May | 970 | 446 | 46 |
| October | 1371 | 606 | 44 |
| All examinations | 3160 | 1377 | 44 |

Breakdown of results by training number (\%) (Table 15)

|  | Failed | Passed | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| In OST | 23 | $25(52 \%)$ | 48 |
| Not in OST | 51 | $37(42 \%)$ | 88 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 74 | $62(46 \%)$ | 136 |

These differences are statistically significant. (0.08 Fishers exact test)
Breakdown of results by deanery (Table 16)

| Deanery | Failed | Passed | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East Midlands | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| East of England | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| East of Scotland | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| KSS | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| London | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| Mersey | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| N Ireland | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| North of Scotland | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Western | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Northern | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Oxford | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Peninsula | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Severn | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| South East of Scotland | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wales | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Wessex | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| West Midlands | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| West of Scotland | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Yorkshire | 4 | 25 | 5 |
|  |  |  | 48 |
| Total | 23 |  |  |

Breakdown of results by stage of training (Table 17)

| Stage | Failed | Passed | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Foundation | 6 | $2(25 \%)$ | 8 |
| ST1 | 14 | $17(55 \%)$ | 31 |
| ST2 | 9 | $8(47 \%)$ | 17 |
| ST3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ST4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total in training | 29 | $27(48 \%)$ | 56 |

Breakdown of results by number of attempts (Table 18)

| Attempts | Failed | Passed | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 (First) | 40 | 33 | 73 |
| 2 | 13 | 21 | 34 |
| 3 | 14 | 3 | 17 |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| $>5(7)$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Any resit | 34 | 29 | 63 |
| Total | 74 | 62 | 136 |

## Appendix 1

 Overall results for each deaneryResult data by deanery has been available since October 2010. The summary results for each deanery are listed below.

| Deanery | Total candidates passed | Total candidates | Pass rate \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East of Scotland | 9 | 9 | 100 |
| Severn | 14 | 21 | 67 |
| Yorkshire | 47 | 72 | 65 |
| Oxford | 18 | 28 | 64 |
| North Western | 31 | 50 | 62 |
| KSS | 33 | 54 | 61 |
| South East of <br> Scotland | 20 | 34 | 59 |
| London | 117 | 210 | 56 |
| East Midlands | 36 | 68 | 53 |
| West of Scotland | 51 | 98 | 52 |
| Northern | 29 | 91 | 52 |
| East of England | 43 | 143 | 47 |
| West Midlands | 67 | 96 | 47 |
| Wessex | 16 | 35 | 46 |
| North of Scotland | 37 | 84 | 46 |
| Wales | 25 | 60 | 44 |
| Peninsula | 41 | 99 | 42 |
| Mersey | 27 | 72 | 41 |
| N Ireland | 705 | 1380 | 38 |
|  |  |  | 51 |
| Total |  |  |  |

