

# Technical review Educational Achievement Specifications

Jeroen Donkers, Maastricht University  
Jean van Berlo, Maastricht University  
November 9, 2012

---

Based on: Educational Achievement Specifications  
Version: 0.42  
Date: July 19, 2012

---

## Introduction



The purpose of this technical review is to investigate the practical application of the educational achievement specification designed by the MedBiquitous Consortium in the context of the ePASS portfolio developed by Mateum B.V. and Maastricht university.


In this review we take the perspective of exporting a portfolio from ePASS using the format provided by the educational achievement specification. Below we describe problems or other noteworthy things we encountered during the mapping process. In general we were able to make a successful mapping.


## EducationalAchievement


**Date:** What is meant by "date" exactly? Is it the date of the export? 


## AchievementInContext


We interpret this element as the curriculum of the learner.  In our case that would be the total learning trajectory of a resident in training. An alternative interpretation would be the different parts/internships within the same trajectory. For example a resident starts their education in an academic hospital (achievementInContext 1) but has internships in peripheral hospitals (achievementInContext 2..n). The interpretation below uses the former. 

**Source:** It is not entirely clear what is meant by "source" – is this the system (ePASS in this case) or the curriculum? 

**ReportID:** This could for example be the internal ePASS user id (idd:www.e-passmaastricht.nl:22304) 


**Intitution:** In our case this could be two institutions: the academic hospital responsible for the training, or the peripheral hospital in which the assessment is actually done in the context of an internship. 


**Program:** these can also be more than one, in case of a super specialization or general preparations such as internal medicine for a cardiology program. In our case it is not meaningful to have the program unspecified. 


**Reportdate:** What is the difference with the "date" in EducationalAchievement? 


## Event


Most elements in the ePASS are captured by **event**. This ranges from workplace assessments, multisource feedback, reflections and appraisals to free text fields like attended congresses, courses and certificates.

**Eventduration**: Is not used widely in ePASS. In the case of the multisource feedback this could capture the running time of the multisource feedback round. 


**Keyword**: Is not used in ePASS. 

**CompetencyObjectReference**: This is fine with us: we know for each form which competencies are being assessed. 


**Resource**: is not used in ePASS. 

**InstructionalMethod / AssessmentMethod**: We would have to make a mapping between form specifications in ePASS and the terms in the vocabulary. 

## AssessmentResults+(Sub)Score+Frameworkscore


Assessment forms in ePASS contain two types of scores. The first is a score that is mapped to one or more competency domains. The second is an overall performance score of this assessment. There is no formal connection between these scores, so one is not a subscore of the other. 


For the first score we can use the **FrameworkScore** element in **Score** or **Subscore** to indicate the competency domain of the score for competency-based workplace assessments (e.g. OSATS). For the second score, the ETS standard can be used.

We were unable to map scores that only have narrative values, so not just a label. This does not fit into a **score** or **subscore** element. 

## Entrustment

In ePASS we make use of Entrustable Professional Activities. But **entrustment** in the specification is lacking a "level of entrustment". We use these roughly translated levels:

- Entrusted to observe only
- Entrusted to perform under heavy supervision 
- Entrusted to perform under light supervision
- Entrusted to perform without supervision
- Entrusted to supervise

So each EPA has an associated level. It is possible for a resident to have more of the same EPA but on different levels as the resident progresses through his education. Moreover, entrustments are awarded on different cases: an individual activity, EPA, or themes, but not on competencies. How should we refer to these cases? 

## Sequence and Integration

In ePASS the learner has the possibility to define labels and an associated period (for example an internship) and connect this label to one or more assessment or other relevant material in the portfolio. We can use **sequences** to describe these periods.

Most specialties that use ePASS define themes in their curriculum. These themes consist of a minimum number of assessments, EPA's and other activities that need to be performed by the resident in order to complete this theme. The **integration** element can be used to describe these themes.

## Portfolio

We need to develop a schema for the ePASS portfolio-elements. This could also contain raw materials such as PDF's, images and other attachments attached to portfolio-elements.

