

MCQ revision Workshop

In this document you will find the schedule for the revision workshop and some instructions for the revision procedure. The materials for discussion are sent to participants separately (please note these materials are confidential. We ask that you keep the folder closed and secure when you are not working on it)

We appreciate your serious preparation that will allow us to maximise our given time.

Contained within this document you will find:

1. Procedure for revision
2. Workshop schedule
3. Information on MCQ construction
4. Review article: Angoff method of standard setting

Procedure for the revision

Please note **in preparation** for each question and their corresponding notes:

- 1) a **global mark of 0, 1 or 2** in the lower right corner.
0=not suitable (too sophisticated/ professionally incorrect/ needs to be rewritten completely)
1=can be used but needs modifications
2=good, can be used without modifications
- 2) a judgement of phrasing
- 3) a judgement of the relation to the syllabus
- 4) a judgement of the scientific correctness
- 5) a judgement of the relevance

Mark your score in the appropriate box at the bottom of the form

Pre-review of phrasing	Pre-review of content Relation to HERMES Syllabus	Scientific	Relevance
<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> relevant to Syllabus	<input type="checkbox"/> correct, definite	<input type="checkbox"/> high
<input type="checkbox"/> correction/s	<input type="checkbox"/> marginal	<input type="checkbox"/> in dispute, ambiguous	<input type="checkbox"/> medium
<input type="checkbox"/> unsuitable	<input type="checkbox"/> not relevant to Syllabus	<input type="checkbox"/> incorrect	<input type="checkbox"/> low
Final decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Question accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> to be rephrased by author	<input type="checkbox"/> rejected

If you think that a question or comment needs to be modified, please **write out your proposal** and bring it to the revision meeting. You can refer to the literature reference cited in the MCQ if available. *As a review, please also read the handout on constructing MCQ's which is included in this folder.*

At the meeting, we will first listen to the marks of all participants for each question. Questions obtaining 2 points from all participants will be accepted without discussion. Questions obtaining 0 points from the majority will be rejected without discussion. As a guide for revision and feedback to the author, the most important reason of rejection will be noted.

6) **Angoff calibration method** for assessment of MCQ difficulty will be done. We kindly ask you to review the questions with this method. *As a guideline, please read the review article "The Angoff Method of Standard Setting for Licensure and Certification Examinations"*

In each MCQ, on the lower right corner, **Angoff Rating:** is indicated. **Please complete the cell with ratings in % with the following question:**

In your opinion, what percentage of minimally competent candidates will answer this item correctly?
In other words: Given 100 minimally competent candidates, how many will answer this item correctly?

Please do not be confused with giving a rating of the average score (percentage of all candidates). Focus on the minimally competent candidates, the ones who will just pass the exam, the "borderline candidate".

We define a **borderline candidate** for standard setting based on an understanding of the concept of the minimal acceptable level of competency for this qualification. Such candidates perform "on the borderline" between acceptable and unacceptable performance and thus have a 50:50 percent chance of passing the examination. The standard setting judges will thus have to assess the percentage of borderline candidates expected to answer each individual question correctly.

Regarding the **Kprime questions**, candidates will receive 1 point for 4 correct answers in one K' question and 0.5 points for 3 correct answers. This has to be rated differently from the A questions.

The judges have to estimate how many out of 100 "borderline candidates" would give 4 correct answers and therefore get the whole point (let's say 30) and add half the number of the borderline candidates who would give 3 correct answers and therefore get 0.5 points (let's say 10) -> in this example their rating should be 35 ($30 + (0.5 \times 10) = 35$).

Please do not hesitate to direct questions or issues, or to request some assistance to hermes@ersnet.org

Workshop Schedule:

Monday, March 14.03.2016	
When	What
08 :30 - 10:00	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30-12:15	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
12:15 - 13:30	Lunch
13:30-16:00	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
16:00 - 16:30	Coffee Break
16:30-18:00	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
18:00	END OF MEETING

Tuesday, March 15.03.2016	
When	What
08:00 - 10:00	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 12:15	Review of MCQ handbook questions and contributions Angoff rating
12:15 - 13:30	Lunch
	END OF MEETING