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Outline & Aims

• Three main subject areas identified from discussions
  1. Programmatic approach to assessment
  2. ePortfolios and workplace based assessments as a global measure for capturing dental student competency
  3. Quality assurance of assessment

• Conference proceedings publication
  – Identify good practice
  – Recommendations for the implementation of assessment strategies in dental curricula
Current issues around assessment

• Validity of only one method of assessment?
• Examiner (/assessor) variability (/reliability)
• How to combine assessment to promote learning?
• Assessment driving learning and still capturing the ‘bad apples’?
• Can an assessment be objective?
• Feedback – time/resources; use to improve the curriculum
• How to assess new assessment tools?
• Level of assessment literacy for faculty. How to get them to change?
• Changing long rooted traditional assessment beliefs - should we be teaching or enhancing learning?
Assessment tools

• Characteristics of an assessment tool
  – Validity
    • Input orientated → outcome based education
    • Professionalism, leadership and management → complex skills → behavioural change
  – Reliability
    • “the assessed is unaware they are being assessed”
    • Generally all assessments are unreliable → increasing number and duration ↑ reliability
  – Educational Impact
    • ‘assessment drives learning’ → poor learning styles (grade hunting/competitiveness)
    • ‘assessment for learning’ → meaningful feedback → longitudinal & global
Programmatic approach to assessment

- Optimises all three characteristics of assessment
  - Validity → ePortfolio → direct observation assessments / WBA’s
  - Reliability → outcomes of all assessments considered (global)
  - Educational → mentors to promote a longitudinal feedback dialogue

- Each assessment is a data point

- Utilises the approach of a ‘continuum of stakes’
  - this is not over-assessment → trust students rather than control

- High stakes decisions
  - more data points considered
  - meaningful aggregation of data needed
Programmatic approach to assessment

• Implementation
  – Stop thinking individually and adopt a more holistic approach
  – Culture change led by programme leads
  – Hybrid systems of programmatic assessment
  – Mentors are essential to guide students **AND** decision makers
  – Decision makers to be unbiased
  – Mentors not final decision makers → protects mentor-student relationship
  – Careful **AND** global consideration of assessments needed for each student

• Enhances ability to assess complex skills and provides evidence
ePortfolios and WBA

- Direct observation: Single encounter methods
  Mini-CEX
- Global performance measures
  Multi-Source Feedback (MSF or 360)
- Aggregation and reflection measures
  Portfolio

A Global measure for capturing dental student competency
ePortfolios and WBA

ePortfolios

• Are very **context specific** and allow “assessment for learning”
• Show **competencies as a whole**
• Allow **measurements over time** by multiple evaluators and multiple sources
• Are **student oriented**
• Stimulate students’ **self-assessment and reflection**
• Allow the **assessment of soft skills** (e.g. professionalism, management etc.)
Different samplings, across different contents and contexts and across different assessors are needed.

In this way subjectivity is not a real problem.

Provision of good feedback is needed.

ePortfolios and WBA

- Objectivity = main issue in assessment
- Different samplings, across different contents and contexts and across different assessors are needed
- In this way subjectivity is not a real problem
- Provision of good feedback is needed
ePortfolios and WBA

Role-play exercise to define examiners’ skills to provide good feedback

• Be **empathetic** and comforting
• **Listen** and be interested in students
• Focus maximum on a **couple of negative points**
• Try to engage students in a dialogue to **make** them to **reflect and self-discover**
• **Express personal feelings**, which students cannot argue against
• **Discuss positive things**, possibly avoiding schematic ways
• Check that **information is understood**
• **Formulate actions** for progression
• Document the dialogue and organize a **follow-up to check improvement**
Quality Assurance (QA) of Assessment

- Different reasons for assessment
  - it drives learning
  - it informs the stakeholders
  - it provides feedback to education

- Different purposes of assessment
  - summative
  - formative
Quality Assurance (QA) of Assessment

Constructive alignment means align the objectives of the curriculum with the tasks that are organized for students to reach these objectives.
Quality Assurance (QA) of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statistics</th>
<th>Item TOTAL Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score1</td>
<td>.5077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score2</td>
<td>.5709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score3</td>
<td>.7208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score4</td>
<td>.3209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score5</td>
<td>.1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score6</td>
<td>.8423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment process

- Objectives & Taxonomy
- Blueprint
- Item analyses & Evaluation
- Assessment
- Item & Scenario writing
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