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| **Reported by (Name):** | **Jacqueline E. Zoberi** |
| **Organization:**  | **American Board of Radiology** |
| **Position Title:** | **Initial Certification Advisory Committee** |
| **Activity:** | **AAPM rep as vice-chair of ETC** |
| **Meeting Dates:** | **Sunday July 30 12-1 pm** |
| **Meeting Location:** | **Denver, CO** |
| **Payment $:** | **None** |
| **Reasons for Attending or not Attending** | **I attended as AAPM ETC rep** |
| **Issues from Previous Meetings or Year:** | **Last year was introductory meeting on July 31, 2016 in DC. For sake of efficiency, I have copied sections from the minutes of that meeting:***Content of the exam and a published study guide*: Dr. Allison explained the purpose of the committee was advise the ABR on policies and procedures that would improve the experience of the IC exams for the candidates. The committee does not set policy. Dr Allison also explained how the membership of the committee was structured.*References:* There was an expressed desire to have a more reliable study guide. The ABR trustees discussed this with the group and explained plans for publishing a study guide that was directly tied to the blueprint that is used to construct the examination*Feedback to Programs:* The members expressed a desire for a set of references that could be used on the IC exam. The ABR trustees explained that the IC exams are different from the MOC exams. On the MOC exams each question is referenced to an item in the study guide. On the IC exams there is a variety of materials available. For example there are a variety of textbooks. The ABR cannot recommend one textbook over another. This is an area where the AAPM Ed Council might be able to provide a document. *Feedback to Candidates* –The candidate members raised the issue of providing more robust feedback so that candidates did not pass an exam would be able to concentrate on their weaknesses. The trustees explained that the ABR is working on this and explained the system. The candidates and program directors felt that numerical scores would not be helpful because of the competition issues. Some of the committee members felt that providing feedback to successful candidates would be of little benefit.*Revision of TG197*- The committee expressed the desire that the next version of TG197 would match the ABR exam blueprint.Future Meetings – The committee will meet at AAPM each year. Additional conference call meetings will be held if appropriate. |
| **General Description of Activities of the Organization and/or Meeting:** | **Here are my notes (*in italics*) from the 2017 meeting agenda:**1. Pertinent activities since 2016 IC Advisory Committee meeting
	1. Content of the exam and a published study guide.

*“content guides” now correlate to what’s on the exam – Part 1 looks good according to the student reps who viewed it & were present at the meeting** 1. Feedback to Programs

*Still a works in progress** 1. Feedback to Candidates

*Still a works in progress at the ABR, but plan is to have feedback related to the content guides on the seven categories. Not at implementation stage yet.** 1. Revision of 197s and work with TG298

*Jay Burmeister asked how certificate program graduates fair on the ABR exams…can we get this data? There are about 100 graduates. Also, does the ABR blueprint follow the exam? If so, this may be helpful information in the revision of 197/197s. This will involve TG298 and also involve Jay’s WG on Medphys Grad Education Programs.*1. New ABR Website

*As of Aug 1, the new website will be released. Jerry Allison is looking for feedback on the new site.*1. Ways to Improve the Initial Certification Process. FREE DISCUSSION.

*Samantha Simiele (student rep) asked when new question types (mult choice, fill in blank, and complex questions) will be added to the exam. She is a member of S&T SC.* *Tony Seibert’s response: complex questions (on part 2 worth 3 points) will be broken up into single point questions. This will happen in a few years.**Fill in blank will be numerical—easier to score.**Jerry Allison: ABR recognized the absence of testing on professionalism and ethics on ABR exams. Matt Podgorsak is developing these questions who stated that TG159 and TG249 nicely outline what should constitute P & E for physicists. Matt used these TG reports to develop questions. Content is now uploaded on ABR website. Start implement for orals in May 2018—1 out of 25 will be P&E content. Not sure yet the number of such questions on Part 1 and Part 2—starting in 2018. Look at the syllabi.**Don Frey was asked by David Jordan (AAPM Professional Council) to comment on re-entry to Part I – they have 5 years to do so. Gave a few extensions, but they had to be pretty severe reasons. Once you’ve re-entered, you have to take the exam every year. No specific requirements in the 5 years.**Jay Burmeister asked about ABR providing feedback on how students have done on the exams. Right now, Don can provide this info manually. Maybe by 2020 ABR can provide these things more automatically. However, current efforts by ABR are focused on MOC. It’s possible that once these efforts are wrapped up, the ABR can start focusing of feedback to students/programs on exam performance.* |
| **Issues for AAPM:** | **No specific issues raised by the members at this meeting…however, there is an agenda item for updates on Revision of 197s and work with TG298, and the updates were limited at this time.**  |
| **Budget Request ($):** | **None** |