

## **Programmatic Assessment in Medical Physics Training in Australasia - 3 years on!**

Cathryn Barbagallo<sup>1</sup>

Alicia Moggre<sup>1</sup>, Michael Bailey<sup>1</sup>, Brendan Hill<sup>1</sup> and Claire Dempsey<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ACPSEM

## **Programmatic Assessment in Medical Physics Training in Australasia– 3 years on!**

C.Barbagallo<sup>1,2,3</sup>, A.Moggré<sup>1,5</sup>, M.Bailey<sup>1,6</sup>, B.Hill<sup>1</sup> and C.Dempsey<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Australasian College of Physical Scientists and Engineers in Medicine (ACPSEM), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Radiation Oncology, Alfred Health, Prahran, Victoria, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Barwon Health, University Hospital, Geelong, Australia

<sup>4</sup> Department of Radiation Oncology, Calvary Mater Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia

<sup>5</sup> Medical Physics and Bioengineering, Te Whatu Ora – Waitaha, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>6</sup> Department of Radiation Oncology Medical Physics, Illawarra Cancer Care Centre, Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia

### **Introduction:**

In 2019, a comprehensive review of the Radiation Oncology medical physics program in Australasia was undertaken. As part of that review, programmatic assessment was formally included and an update to the curriculum and framework was released in 2022. This framework forms the basis for the clinically based TEAP (“Training, Education and Assessment Program”) managed by ACPSEM<sup>1</sup>.

Assessments were initially chosen by a representative panel of educators and examiners. The requirements for progression between three formalised training stages during the three-year program was nominally set by the Radiation Oncology Certification Panel (ROCP).

### **Method:**

A review was conducted by the national training coordination team three years following the new program implementation. The review assessed the suitability of the assessment methods and stage progression requirements based on cumulated feedback from registrars, supervisors and others involved in the program. A further review was conducted on the Clinical and Scientific Report (CaSR) guidelines. All reviews included case examples of registrars, discussion and ensuring alignment to the initial intent of progressive assessment.

### **Results and Conclusion:**

The review of the learning outcomes assessments found that the vast majority still provided optimal assessment for registrars. Some learning outcomes were modified to include other options, for example, including optional oral assessments alongside/instead of a practical assessment. Progression requirements between stages were modified to include different options for opportunistic learning, and clarification was added to the CaSR guidelines on the intent and scope of work for some reports. The review also flagged the need for additional guidance to program users regarding scope of knowledge included within each learning outcome, with work ongoing on a project initiated to provide this information. A formalised survey scheduled for later in 2025 will assess how well all changes meet the needs of program users. It is anticipated that routine reviews of the curriculum will continue during the lifetime

of this training program to ensure that it delivers high quality content and appropriate assessment.

1. Barbagallo, C., Osborne, K., & Dempsey, C. (2024). Implementation of a programmatic assessment model in radiation oncology medical physics training. *Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acm2.14354>