



NBPME Reports

The National Board of Podiatric Medical Examiners Newsletter

Annual Meeting

The Board held its Annual Meeting August 9th in conjunction with the educational meeting of APMA. NBPME elections take place annually. The results were:

Board Members for a three year term

College Educator Member - Robert Christman, D.P.M.

FPMB Member - John McCord, D.P.M.

State Board Member - Murray Goldstein, D.P.M.

Officers for 2003-04

President - Murray Goldstein, D.P.M.

Vice President - Stuart Tessler, D.P.M.

Treasurer - John McCord, D.P.M.

Application Fee Increased

After three years at \$625.00 (and five years with no change in the fee) the application fee for each one of our three examinations was increased to \$900.00 beginning with the December, 2003 Part III Examination. The following factors contributed to the increase:

1. The administration of a Part I Examination in January, 2003 at no charge to most of the candidates.
2. The conversion to paper and pencil examinations for Parts I and II and their administration at seven centers throughout the country.

Table of Contents

Annual Meeting.....	1
Application Fee Increased.....	1
Application Fee Increased (cont.).....	2
NBPME/FPMB Agreement.....	2
Student Questions (APMSA).....	2
Student Questions (APMSA-cont.)...3	
Editorial Comment.....	3
Conclusion.....	3

Application Fee Increased (continued)

3. Cut score studies after each examination.
4. Extensive item writing for Parts I and II-due to the conversion.
5. New contract with the Chauncey Group International (CGI).
6. Costs for travel, conference calls and trial expenditures for court suits.
7. A decrease in candidates tested annually from 1,700 to 1,400 due to the decrease in college enrollments.

Except for the CGI contract and the decrease in candidates tested, the other factors were the result of the security breach with the Part I July, 2002 Examination.

NBPME/FPMB Agreement

The National Board and the Federation of Podiatric Medical Boards completed an updated version of their contract. FPMB provides the transcript service for the Part III Examination.

Student Questions (APMSA)

Representatives from NBPME met with APMSA in August, 2002 in Seattle, Washington. The meeting was successful in exchanging information on important issues, and in establishing a foundation for periodic meetings once or twice a year. Unfortunately, NBPME's willingness to meet with APMSA leaders in February and August, 2003 was rejected.

As an interim step to the next meeting, the National Board Members agreed to answer questions submitted by student organizations from each college.

Question: *Were the ratio of actual test questions on the Part I July, 2003 Exam from each subject the same as outlined in the Bulletin of Information?*

Answer: *The question is often asked after the Part I Exam. The percentage of items in each subject is always reviewed by Chauncey. In this case, a Board Member and the Executive Director also reviewed the July, 2003 items. The items fit the percentage per subject described in the Bulletin. Furthermore, the Deans examined the test at a special meeting with NBPME on October 11th.*

Question: *Was the normal protocol followed for creating basic science items (questions)?*

Answer: *Yes. The items were written by college faculty following the established item writing process. Each item was then reviewed by two separate processes to insure currency, content percentages, difficulty level and priority.*

Question: *Was each item's performance reviewed after the test?*

Answer: *Each item is always reviewed by a Preliminary Item Analysis (PIA) before the exam is scored. Any item so identified is then reviewed by a content expert. That review results in a credit given to that item or the item counts in the scoring as presented.*

Student Questions (APMSA – continued)

Question: *Were “old” items reviewed to insure currency?*

Answer: *Yes.*

Question: *The examination did not represent the basic science curriculum at the podiatric medical schools.*

Answer: *The examination is not designed to measure or evaluate the curriculum (see page 3 and 8 of the Part I 2003 Bulletin of Information).*

Question: *In the past only ninety questions were administered with additional testlets as needed. How does the grading of this exam differ, as a one hundred fifty question test, from last year?*

Answer: *In previous years we used computer mastery tests. The July, 2003 Exam was a linear exam with a set number of items for all candidates to answer.*

Question: *Does Chauncey statistically evaluate questions.*

Answer: *Yes, it is standard procedure.*

The questions/comments submitted by students will be reviewed by the Board and Chauncey in a review of our test development procedures.

Editorial Comment

One of NBPME’s greatest frustrations is that candidates, in general, do not read the Bulletin of Information. Letters and telephone calls we receive support that view. Careful attention should have been paid to page 5 through 9 of the Part I 2003 Bulletin of Information (and similar sections of each annual bulletin).

Conclusion

While the question and answer section of this Newsletter hopefully clarifies some issues, this forum cannot substitute for a face-to-face meeting between NBPME and the leaders of APMSA. We look forward to the meetings.

National Board of Podiatric Medical Examiners (Parts I, II & III-PMLexis)
P. O. Box 510
Bellefonte, PA 16823
Tel: (814) 357-0487
Fax: (814) 357-0581