



ANGUS S. KING, JR.
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MAINE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
16 EDISON DRIVE
AUGUSTA, MAINE
04330

MICHAEL F. KELLY
COMMISSIONER

JAY BRADSHAW
DIRECTOR

**Examination Committee Retreat
Tuesday, July 27, 1999
Maple Hill Farm, Hallowell**

Minutes

Present: J. LeBrun, J. Vaniotis, E. Ekholm, D. Bahr, R. Doughty, D. Kinney

Absent: T. Beals, B. Zito

Staff: D. Corning, D. White

Guest: R. Bumps

1. Call To Order - The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

A. Introductions

J. Vaniotis welcomed Dwight Corning as the facilitator for the retreat

2. Minutes - June 15, 1999, meeting minutes - review for acceptance

The minutes of the June 15, 1999, meeting was reviewed, and note was made that in section 5, the date for the retreat should read July 27, 1999 instead of July 17, 1999.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 18, 1999, MEETING AS CORRECTED (BAHR; Ekholm - Motion Carries)

3. Current Issues Facing the Exam Committee

D. Corning led the group through a facilitated discussion

A. Agenda for Facilitated Discussion

1. Introductions
2. Roles



ANGUS S. KING, JR.
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MAINE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
16 EDISON DRIVE
AUGUSTA, MAINE
04330

MICHAEL F. KELLY
COMMISSIONER

JAY BRADSHAW
DIRECTOR

3. Ground Rules

4. Purpose
5. Desired Outcomes
 - a. Assumptions
 - b. Needs & Issues
6. Brainstorm Task #1
7. Prioritize Task #1
8. Brainstorm Task #2
9. Blueprint Task #2
10. Waiting Room
11. Rules Changes

B. Purpose:

1. To develop a work plan for the next 12 months
2. To develop a process for reviewing & creating exams.
3. Develop list of issues/needs for system.

C. Desired Outcomes:

1. A prioritized work plan to guide the exam committee for the next 12 months, considering resources, support, etc.
2. A blueprint outlining the process that will be used to develop new exams.

D. System Assumptions:

1. Must take written practical exam to license.
2. System is in place, just needs occasional fine tuning.
3. Exam process is same statewide.
4. Positive relationship between exam & performance.
5. License exam must be separate from a course.
6. Examiners & Exam Admins need more training.
7. Exam process is adequate.
8. Candidates come prepared to exam.
9. Successful completion of exam = successful field performance.
10. Success in class = success on test.
11. Students should be prepared for practical exam because they have the exam skill sheets.
12. System has equipment & manpower to administer exams.
13. Pay is sufficient to attract good examiners.
14. Thoughtful work of exam committee is supported by Maine Board of EMS, Ops, etc.
15. Instructors are familiar with the exam process.
16. Instructors have up-to-date skills sheets
17. "Pink Sheet" is accurate.
18. Don't have financial resources to examine or measure competency in any other way.

19. Exam needs to be skill based.
20. Exam must be convenient, timely, & in mass.
21. Exam must be on paper (not computer).
22. No oral exams.
23. We can't change what is in the rules.
24. Exams will weed out those who are not prepared to work in field.
25. If everyone passes, exam is too easy.
26. Must pass approved licensure course to take exam.
27. EMS providers are customers.

D. Issues

1. Adequate equipment & personnel for testing is difficult - Improve consistency
2. Practical exam administration needs to be structured differently-larger multi-region or statewide tests
3. Need to be more demanding of examiners. Quality needs to be high.
4. Identify characteristics of examiners.
5. Sufficient resources could significantly change the process.
6. Need to look outside EMS for different methods of testing.
7. Why do we test the way we test?
8. Is there a need for an "apprenticeship" before "full" licensure.
9. Information interpretation between people/regional/etc. - How is information dispersed?
10. Lack of systems philosophy to administration of exams.
 - Establish standards
 - Provide resources
11. Examining is a core function, but is not "treated" as a priority.
12. State assigns responsibility for examining to Region, but in fine detail dictates the process.
 - This process is significantly different than the process for education, QA, etc.
13. Exam process is very similar statewide, variation comes in examiner utilization of pass/fail criteria.
14. For written exams - paperwork process needs to be clarified.
15. Need to provide service to our customers.
16. Gold card system is difficult when a candidate crosses regions.
17. What happens to our collective knowledge? What is documented?
18. Do we have any measures or analysis of our exam system?
19. Do we work on fine tuning, or major redesign?
20. How do we link exam results back to the education process? Feedback to instructors/regions on student performance.
21. Is proof of competency maintained without retesting?
22. How do we develop an exam to be sure we are testing the right information?
23. Do we test in the right way (info regurgitation, scenario based, randomized skills...)
 - Are we thinking broadly enough about the "right way"

Is the question “can you splint” or “do you know when to splint”.

What are we trying to measure.

24. Examiner training - State or Regional function

New/Ongoing

“Certify” examiners

25. Involvement or attendance at National programs regarding examining, much as we do currently with education.

26. What is attrition rate of examiners?

27. Pay related?

28. What is the charge for the exam committee? How do they interact with other committees?

29. Students need more knowledge of exam process.

30. Instructor needs complete knowledge of exam process - How & when do they get the knowledge?

31. Course leading to licensure must be completed before testing - Necessary?

32. Who are the customers of the Exam Committee?

E. Prioritization of Technical Issues

1. Need to be more demanding of examiners. Quality needs to be high

Examiner training - State or Regional function

- New, Ongoing
- “Certify” examiners

2. Adequate equipment & personnel for testing is difficult - Improve consistency

Sufficient resources could significantly change the process.

What is attrition rate of examiners?

3. Information interpretation between people/regional/etc. - How is information dispersed?

For written exams - paperwork process needs to be clarified

Gold card system is difficult when a candidate crosses regions.

Course leading to licensure must be completed before testing - Necessary

Who are customers of the exam committee?

4. Exam process is very similar statewide, variation comes in examiner utilization of pass/fail criteria.

Do we have any measures or analysis of our exam system?

How do we link exam results back to the education process? Feedback to instructors/regions on student performance.

5. How do we develop an exam to be sure we are testing the right information?

F. Prioritization of Philosophical Issues

1. Need to look outside EMS for different methods of testing.
Why do we test the way we test?
Do we work on fine tuning, or major redesign?
2. Do we test in the right way (info regurgitation, scenario based, randomized skills...)
Are we thinking broadly enough about the “right way”
Is the question “can you splint” or “do you know when to splint”.
What are we trying to measure.
3. Examining is a core function, but is not “treated” as a priority.
4. Lack of systems philosophy to administration of exams.
Establish standards
Provide resources
5. Practical exam administration needs to be structured differently-larger multi-region or statewide tests
6. Is there a need for an “apprenticeship” before “full” licensure?
7. What happens to our collective knowledge? What is documented?
8. Examiner training - State or Regional function
New
Ongoing
“Certify” examiners
Need to be more demanding of examiners. Quality needs to be high
Identify characteristics of examiners.
9. What is the charge for the exam committee? How do they interact with other committees?
10. Involvement or attendance at National programs regarding examining, much as we do currently with education.
11. Need to provide service to our customers.
Who are the customers of the Exam Committee?

4. Exam Administrator; Proctor; and, Examiner Training

Due to limited time this issue to be discussed at the September, 21, 1999, meeting

5. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Drexell White