



eos2015
V E N I C E

91st Congress of the European Orthodontic Society
June 13-18 / 2015 Venice / Italy

Minutes of the 10th European Orthodontic Teachers' Forum Venice Lido (Italy), 14.06.2014

Chairpersons: A.M. Kuijpers Jagtman, S. Kiliaridis, P. Pirttiniemi

Attendees: 67 attendees

(PP, SK) Welcome and introduction

Professor Pertti Pirttiniemi opened the meeting at 10:15hr and welcomed all participants. He read the minutes of the last meeting in Warsaw. The minutes were approved.

Professor Stavros Kiliaridis gave outlined the history of NEBEOP; minimum criteria for membership; the application process for provisional and full membership in NEBEOP; the application procedure (including support from 2 full members of NEBEOP); and an update of the Erasmus programme.

(AK) Final examination assessment procedures at end of the postgraduate program in Orthodontics

Professor Kuijpers-Jagtman gave a short presentation about the history of the Erasmus programme and the updated guidelines that were published in June 2014 in the European Journal of Orthodontics (Huggare *et al.* Europ J Orthod 2014;36: 340-349).

Nowadays most teaching models, both undergraduate and postgraduate, are based on the CanMeds model. According to this model the competencies to be reached at the start of a professional career include being a Medical expert, Communicator, Collaborator, Manager, Health advocate, Scholar, and Professional.

A competency is the ability to perform a professional activity in an authentic context and in an adequate manner. This asks for integrating and applying knowledge, skills, attitudes and personal characteristics.

Competency based learning asks for a different approach when it comes to assessment. On the other hand, assessment drives learning. Therefore we see a shift from assessment of learning to assessment *for* learning. Another important issue is that one method can't do it all:

- Assessments are part of continuum, any single assessment data point is flawed
- Validity of non-standardized assessment is questionable
- Reliable information is based on using many judgements
- Incorporation of learner's view in the assessment procedure (self-assessment)

What does this mean for assessing orthodontic residents:

- More observations
- More feedback based on observation
- Collecting feedback based on observations
- Focus on learning
- More diverse assessment situations
- More evaluators
- More reflection

The aim of the Teachers' Forum is to provide a discussion forum on undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and research in orthodontics. Professor Kuijpers-Jagtman recalled the topics that were dealt with over the past 10 years:

2006	Strengths and weaknesses of orthodontic education in Europe
2007	Development of NEBEOP and collaboration between postgraduate program
2008	Self-assessment for quality control
2009	The minimum requirements for the undergraduate orthodontic curriculum
2010	How do we learn? Adult learning
2011	New ways of learning
2012	E-learning
2013	Competency based postgraduate education
2014	Quality assurance in postgraduate education
2015	Final examination assessment procedures

Dr. Julian O'Neill, president of EFOSA

Dr. Julian O'Neill spoke about EFOSA and its connection to specialty examination; its goal is to improve quality of care; improve the standard of education in orthodontics; move towards standardized exit examinations in postgraduate programmes. EFOSA has enjoyed an improved relationship with NEBEOP over the past few years, as exemplified that the Council has attended EFOSA meetings in the past years. EFOSA will help NEBEOP with the website and wished to fund a project which moves towards these common goals. EFOSA would like to give an award (with €) for a teaching project.

EFOSA wants to work collaboratively with the teachers Forum and the NEBEOP and is willing to support NEBEOP financially.

(SK) Results of the survey/ questionnaire

The Network of Erasmus Based European Orthodontic Programmes is aware of the diversity of laws concerning specialist education in orthodontics between different EU countries. It seems that there is also a huge diversity in the procedures and the specific examinations necessary to obtain the title of specialist in Orthodontics after finishing a postgraduate education in Orthodontics. Therefore, in preparation for the topic of the 2015 meeting Kiliaridis, Kuijpers-Jagtman and Pirttiniemi conducted a survey in all European Union countries and the EEA countries plus Switzerland on the official national examinations that are necessary for a dentist to pass, in order to obtain the title of specialist in Orthodontics of his/her country, after finishing a specialist education program in Orthodontics. Professor Kiliaridis presented the preliminary results. About all countries information was obtained except from Luxemburg and the survey of Bulgaria was incomplete. The survey will be finalized next year.

Discussion in smaller groups

Professor David Rice agreed to act as discussion leader for this part of the program. To structure the discussion, he proposed three discussion topics:

1. Conditions to fulfill the ideal assessment procedure at end of orthodontic postgraduate education
2. Discussion on strong and weak points of the assessment procedures
3. Formulation of implementation strategies

The participants were divided into groups (6) and they discussed in their group in the small meeting rooms. After the break-out session the group returned to the main meeting room to share what was discussed.

Each group presented on their ideas about the 3 discussion topics:

Topic 1: Conditions to fulfill the ideal assessment procedure at end of orthodontic postgraduate education

Group A: Due to the variation of opinions within the group, they experienced difficulty coming to a consensus. A competency test is required. Final assessment must cover a full spectrum of unseen cases; there is an inherent difficulty of standardization. One of the goals of the final assessment is that it should enable more movement of orthodontists between countries.

Group B: The curriculum duration is 3 years; final assessments consist of varying numbers of cases; on average there are 3-10 case presentations and unknown case presentations. Should you keep or skip the final exam? 1 country has chosen for a continuous exam, with a learning curve. The Association for Dental Education in Europe (ADEE) proposes new assessment methods for standardization and harmonization: for example the log book. Political changes in Denmark (namely via the National Board of Health) are forcing the removal of final exams for orthodontists. This is one of the reasons why the group proposes finding alternative methods for an assessment.

Group C: The majority of the participants in this group vote to keep the final exam, and think that continuous evaluation is good and also needed. Theoretical aspects and research projects; case presentations on 5-10 cases; treatment plan for 2 cases; combination of oral and written case presentations. The calibration of examiners is vital. Defense of the research project: should this be a part of the final exam/ evaluation or not?

Topic 2: the strong and weak points of the assessment procedures

Group D: there were a lot of differences among the countries' training programmes: political organizations, languages, rules, patients treated according to various means (paid by the government vs. not paid by the government). Presentation on the research project and a theoretical exam are done at the end of the training programme.

Weak points of these assessment procedures are that there are too many political, economical differences among the countries. A suggestion has been made to have discussions with various societies (ADEE, EFOSA, EOS etc) to find a minimum standard, external examiners from a board of examiners. The group finds that the methods of examination are less important than the outcomes thereof.

Group E: there are separate examinations during the whole period of the training; basic theoretical level; number of cases (not too many). Weak points are that there is too much paperwork for the postgraduate evaluation. Economical constraints and administrative issues limit the possibilities.

Group F: Strong points of the assessment procedure include the fact that it has a motivational purpose for the students and integrates knowledge. Weak points are that the final exam occurs too late; the exams reflect knowledge at one point in time. Resources (teachers, finances) are needed.

Topic 3: Formulation of implementation strategies

Group E: one implementation strategy is the use of (international) external examiners; use of unseen cases; oral examination and also peer assessment at the end of the training.

Group F: formal evaluation every year; examination board comprising of orthodontists from universities and from private practice. Kuijpers-Jagtman asks how these two groups will be aligned for conducting the final assessments. Dr. Schwetska-Polly thinks that examiners should have experience with both cases and actual patients (the clinical aspect is the most important). An excellent researcher does not automatically make an excellent examiner; similarly, an excellent orthodontist does not automatically mean he/she is an excellent examiner. Therefore, training is needed in order to be an examiner.

Obstacles for implementation: practicalities for students, examiners and programmes. There should be more meetings planned to discuss these issues.

Dr. Rice posed the following question to the participants: who are the examiners? Who should they be? Students themselves (peers); internal teachers; external teachers?

Group G: the final exam should include: case presentations, an oral exam (1-2 cases); diagnostics of unseen cases; theoretical (general knowledge, based on journal content, latest issues of the journals); research project of each individual with an article or poster (this should be done 3-6 months in advance of the final exam). Obstacles to implementation include the fact that components should be spread over a period of time and not only over 1-2 days.

Summary of points (see presentation professor David Rice)

Question/ topic 1:

- A final exam is desired, however one must evaluate why it is needed: to test knowledge, or test performance (public funds are invested in these students who in turn will be engaged in public service)
- The final assessment should be a part of the training programme and should be aligned with the desired learning outcome
- Assessment motivates students, teachers and institutions. The main goal is to ensure that patients are protected.

Question/ topic 2:

- Most institutions have a 360 degree/ multi-faceted assessment. A log book is a powerful assessment tool. Long cases are presented: this aspect of the assessment would be difficult to standardize
- OSCE (Objective Structured Clinical Examinations): this is an idea for evaluation of post-graduate training. The final exam should not be final, but a launching point for their future career
- Stakeholders are important
- There are pros and cons with an oral exam.

Question/ topic 3:

The following are needed for implementation:

- Harmonization: international representation for standardization of exam procedures is vital.
- Communication
- Finances, time, resources (since there is a wide variation in costs for doing exams)

David Rice: students must be put a bit out of their comfort zone, to test what they know. That is one of the reasons for a final assessment.

(AK) Closure of the meeting

Anne Marie thanked David Rice for chairing the discussion groups and ensured the participants she will distribute the papers sent by Dr. Rice. Suggestions for future Teachers' Forums are most welcome and can be sent via e-mail to AK, SK, and PP. Anne Marie thanked everyone for their participation and wished them a productive time at the congress.

Nijmegen, Geneva, Oulu, Leuven, July 2015

Anne Marie Kuijpers-Jagtman, Stavros Kiliaridis, Pertti Pirttiniemi, Guy Willems

Contact details

- Professor Stavros Kiliaridis, Geneva, Switzerland
E-mail Stavros.Kiliaridis@unige.ch
- Professor Anne Marie Kuijpers-Jagtman, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
E-mail AnneMarie.Kuijpers-Jagtman@radboudumc.nl
- Professor Pertti Pirttiniemi, Oulu, Finland
E-mail Pertti.Pirttiniemi@oulu.fi
- Professor Guy Willems, Leuven, Belgium
E-mail guy.willems@med.kuleuven.be

Management assistant

Mrs. Leiba Stuart-Young
NEBEOP_EOTF@ProtonMail.com