Portfolio as a part of GP’s specialististic exam: some obstacles?
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4 topics

• GP’s specialisation - Vocational training
• Final – specialistic exam
• Portfolio assessment
• Obstacles
GP’s specialisation - VT

- 3 years
- Postgraduate course – 7 month
- Hospital and outpatients – 14 month
- GP’s practices – trainers – 12 month
GP’s specialistic exam

2 parts:
- Preparatory
- Final
Specialistic exam - Preparatory

- Portfolio
- Written essays
- Trainer’s report
Specialistic exam - Final

• Written test – 150 (MCQ, EMQ)
• OSCE – 25 stations
• Oral – 3 members jury
Designing Portfolio

Focus group – teachers, trainees

• Purpose – learning and assessment tool
• Content - semistructured
• Quality – reflection - criteria
• Training the assessors
Portfolio - content

- Learning self-assessment form
- Log book - diary
- Patient’s cases: clinical, family, terminally ill, difficult patients
- Experience in organisational issues
- Experience in communicational issues
- Experience in managerial issues
- Quality development – audit
- Self-assessment’s form: consultation, communication, professional performance
- Others – personal choices
Portfolio – quality assessment
Portfolio – training the examiners

9 examiners

Training schema:
• Introduction – content, criteria, mark sheet
• Review of portfolio - individual assessment
• Comparison - discussion in the group
• Making a consensus

• 10 portfolios
Portfolio - Obstacles

- Written essays Learning / assessment tool?
- Reflective learning / collection of papers?
- Long-life learning / CPD?
- Structured / individualised?
- Defining criteria / standardisation / qualitative?
- Inter-examiners variation – training?
- Time and resources consuming!
- Part of summative assessment?
Portfolio - experience

- Reviewed by 3 examiners independently
- Reaching a consensus among examiners
- Discussed with trainees