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## 1 Introduction

44 candidates sat the Kuching June 2023 Refraction Certificate exam. The examination consists 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.

### 1.1 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 |

### 1.2 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:

- CR1-CR4: Cycloplegic retinoscopy
- NCR1 - NCR2: Non cycloplegic retinoscopy
- CYL: Subjective refraction cylinder
- LN: Lens neutralisation
- SRS: Subjective refraction sphere
- BB: Binocular balance


## 2 Summary

The Hofstee method of standard setting was used to generate the pass mark for this examination, with a final pass mark of 103/150 (68.7\%). Candidates scored highest on stations CR2, CR3 and CR4 (Retinoscopy stations) and lowest on the SRS (Subjective), NR2 (Retinoscopy) and BB (Subjective) stations. The overall exam pass rate was $75.0 \%$, consistent with those of recent previous exams.

The reliability of the exam was 0.41 ; this falls below the desired level of 0.80 . Eight of the 10 stations contributed positively to the reliability. Stations CR2 and NR1 did not contribute positively to the reliability; there is a negative/weak (respectively) relationship between scores on these stations and overall total score. The SRS and BB station scores correlate most strongly with overall performance.

## 3 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.

### 3.1 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 $=75 \%$
- The minimum credible pass mark for the examination $=60 \%$
- The maximum credible pass rate for the examination $=100 \%$
- The minimum credible pass rate for the examination $=0 \%$

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. This pass mark is rounded to the nearest achievable mark.

The Hofstee pass mark for this examination was 103/150 (68.7\%).

## 4 Results

Table 1: Results summary

| Statistic | Value | Percentage |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of candidates | 44 |  |
| Maximum possible mark | 150 |  |
| Mean candidate mark | 107.0 | $71.4 \%$ |
| Median candidate mark | 106.5 | $71.0 \%$ |
| Standard deviation | 13.73 | $9.2 \%$ |
| Highest candidate mark | 133 | $88.7 \%$ |
| Lowest candidate mark | 78 | $52.0 \%$ |
| Reliability | 0.411 |  |
| Standard error of measurement (SEM) | 10.54 | $7.0 \%$ |
| Hofstee pass mark | $103 / 150$ | $68.7 \%$ |
| Pass rate | $33 / 44$ | $75.0 \%$ |



Figure 1: Distribution of marks

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

Table 2: Station summary

| Station | Category | Mean | Median | Standard deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CR1 | 10.93 | 11.00 | 3.18 | 1 | 15 |
| 2 | CR2 | 12.93 | 14.00 | 2.56 | 4 | 15 |
| 3 | CR3 | 13.11 | 14.00 | 2.76 | 3 | 15 |
| 4 | CR4 | 12.27 | 14.00 | 4.04 | 2 | 15 |
| 5 | NR1 | 10.07 | 9.50 | 3.39 | 2 | 15 |
| 6 | NR2 | 8.61 | 9.00 | 4.01 | 0 | 15 |
| 7 | CYL | 11.57 | 12.00 | 2.85 | 4 | 15 |
| 8 | LN | 9.84 | 10.00 | 5.04 | 0 | 15 |
| 9 | SRS | 8.43 | 9.00 | 2.58 | 2 | 13 |
| 10 | BB | 8.98 | 9.50 | 3.56 | 0 | 14 |

Stations highlighted in green have a mean station score above twelve (highest mean scores) whilst the stations coloured red have the lowest mean scores.

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

## Table 3: Weights for each skill

| Clinical Skill | Number of stations | Contribution to total marks | Median mark |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retinoscopy | 6 | $60 \%$ | 13.00 |
| Subjective | 3 | $30 \%$ | 10.00 |
| Other | 1 | $10 \%$ | 10.00 |

## Table 4: Correlation between stations

|  | CR1 | CR2 | CR3 | CR4 | NR1 | NR2 | CYL | LN | SRS |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CR2 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CR3 | 0.18 | -0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CR4 | 0.08 | -0.03 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NR1 | 0.12 | -0.13 | -0.24 | -0.22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NR2 | -0.04 | -0.33 | 0.01 | -0.06 | 0.45 |  |  |  |  |
| CYL | -0.03 | -0.03 | 0.15 | -0.01 | -.0 .06 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
| LN | 0.00 | -0.16 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.22 |  |  |
| SRS | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.14 |  |
| BB | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.17 | -0.03 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.59 |

Cells are highlighted green if the correlation is greater than 0.5 , orange if the correlation is between 0 and 0.2 and red if the correlation is negative.

The median correlation between all stations was 0.04 . There were 14 negatively correlated stations, and 22/45 instances of a weak relationship between stations. Scores on stations CR2 and CR4 correlated least well with scores on the other stations. The strongest correlation was between SRS and BB scores (0.59); this is a common pattern.

Table 5: Correlation between each station score and total score

| Station | CR1 | CR2 | CR3 | CR4 | NR1 | NR2 | CYL | LN | SRS | BB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Correlation with <br> total score | 0.16 | -0.18 | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.42 | 0.34 |

Table 5 shows the corrected station-total correlation. This is the correlation between the station score and the overall total score without the score of that specific station included. Data suggests that stations SRS (Subjective Refraction: Sphere) and BB (Binocular Balancing) are the best discriminators. CR2 scores correlate negatively with overall total scores.

## 5 Breakdown of results

Table 6: Breakdown of results by demographic groups

| Demographics | Pass | Total | Pass rate (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity (grouped) |  |  |  |
| Asian - Chinese | 17 | 20 | 85.0 |
| Asian - Indian | 3 | 6 | 50.0 |
| Asian - Other | 3 | 6 | 50.0 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Unknown | 8 | 10 | 80.0 |
| PMQ |  |  |  |
| UK | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| OS | 32 | 43 | 74.4 |
| Unknown | 1 | 1 | 100.0 |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 14 | 17 | 82.4 |
| Female | 15 | 21 | 71.4 |
| Unknown | 4 | 6 | 66.7 |

## 6 Comparison to previous examinations

Table 7: Comparison to previous years' exams

| Date | Centre | Number of Candidates | Pass <br> mark | Pass rate | Pass rate in OST | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { candidates } \\ \text { in OST } \end{gathered}$ | Reliability (alpha) | SEM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June-23 | Kuching | 44 | 69\% | 75\% | n/a | n/a | 0.41 | 11 (7\%) |
| May-23 | Birmingham | 75 | 70\% | 71\% | n/a | n/a | 0.79 | 10 (7\%) |
| Jan-23 | Singapore | 22 | 71\% | 82\% | 100\% | 5\% | 0.54 | 9 (6\%) |
| Dec-22 | London | 63 | 69\% | 62\% | 86\% | 22\% | 0.73 | 11 (7\%) |
| Jul-22 | Glasgow | 109 | 72\% | 81\% | n/a | n/a | 0.85 | 9 (6\%) |
| May-22 | Birmingham | 83 | 72\% | 80\% | 94\% | 20\% | 0.77 | 9 (6\%) |
| May-22 | Delhi | 33 | 66\% | 39\% | n/a | n/a | 0.81 | 11 (7\%) |
| Apr-22 | Cairo | 36 | 73\% | 86\% | n/a | n/a | 0.76 | 8 (5\%) |
| Dec-21 | Singapore | 131 | 72\% | 79\% | 80\% | 31\% | 0.78 | 10 (6\%) |
| May-21 |  | 171 | 71\% | 57\% | 58\% | 42\% | 0.83 | 10 (7\%) |
| Jan-21 |  | 39 | 74\% | 92\% | n/a | n/a | 0.51 | 9 (6\%) |
| Dec-20 |  | 141 | 70\% | 57\% | 72\% | 56\% | 0.81 | 11 (8\%) |
| Jun-19 |  | 40 | 70\% | 57\% | n/a | n/a | 0.73 | 11 (7\%) |
| Jun-19 |  | 52 | 74\% | 67\% | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | 0.76 | 9 (6\%) |
| Apr-19 |  | 87 | 72\% | 59\% | 68\% | 51\% | 0.54 | 12 (6\%) |
| Dec-18 |  | 68 | 72\% | 54\% | 70\% | 63\% | 0.7 | 11 (6\%) |
| Jul-18 |  | 64 | 75\% | 67\% | 77\% | 55\% | 0.74 | 11 (6\%) |
| Jun-18 |  | 39 | 75\% | 74\% | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | 0.69 | 10 (5\%) |
| Apr-18 |  | 60 | 75\% | 68\% | 73\% | 75\% | 0.55 | 10 (6\%) |
| Dec-17 |  | 63 | 71\% | 56\% | 59\% | 65\% | 0.72 | 11 (6\%) |
| Jul-17 |  | 62 | 72\% | 61\% | 68\% | 60\% | 0.7 | 12 (6\%) |
| Apr-17 |  | 63 | 73\% | 67\% | 69\% | 62\% | 0.7 | 11 (6\%) |
| Jan-17 |  | 62 | 72\% | 63\% | 64\% | 90\% | 0.6 | 10 (6\%) |
| Jul-16 |  | 64 | 70\% | 64\% | 67\% | 67\% | 0.6 | 12 (7\%) |
| Jun-16 |  | 23 | 70\% | 57\% | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | 0.7 | 11 (6\%) |
| Mar-16 |  | 57 | 77\% | 81\% | 83\% | 70\% | 0.9 | 7.7 (4\%) |
| Jan-16 |  | 70 | 70\% | 60\% | 60\% | 81\% | 0.8 | 10 (6\%) |
| Jul-15 |  | 31 | 66\% | 58\% | 55\% | 65\% | 0.65 | 9.4 (5\%) |
| Jun-15 |  | 33 | 69\% | 58\% | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ | 0.73 | 10 (6\%) |
| Apr-15 |  | 57 | 77\% | 65\% | 73\% | 65\% | 0.4 | 11 (7\%) |
| Dec-14 |  | 63 | 71\% | 68\% | 77\% | 68\% | 0.6 | 12 (7\%) |
| Jul-14 |  | 34 | 74\% | 62\% | 55\% | 65\% | 0.4 | 11 (6\%) |
| Apr-14 |  | 56 | 73\% | 84\% | 89\% | 66\% | 0.6 | 9.5 (5\%) |
| Dec-13 |  | 75 | 72\% | 67\% | 76\% | 65\% | 0.7 | 10 (6\%) |
| Jul-13 |  | 42 | 72\% | 74\% | 90\% | 48\% | 0.7 | 10 (6\%) |
| Apr-13 |  | 64 | 74\% | 61\% | 64\% | 64\% | 0.8 | 11 (6\%) |

Table 8: Performance of candidate by deanery for all examinations to date, where deanery is known

|  | Deanery | Total <br> passes | Total <br> candidate <br> s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Pass rate \%

