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Mission Statement of the JCNDE

“The JCNDE develops and conducts highly reliable, state of the art cognitive examinations that assist regulatory agencies in making valid decisions regarding licensure of oral health care professionals, develops and implements policy for the orderly, secure, and fair administration of its examinations, and is a leader and resource in assessment for the oral health care profession.”
The purpose of the National Board Examinations is to assist state boards in determining the qualifications of dentists/dental hygienists who seek licensure to practice dentistry/dental hygiene.

- The NBDEs and NBDHE assess the abilities of candidates to understand and apply learned information in a problem-solving context.
- State boards use the information provided by the NBDE or NBDHE to help protect the public health.
DTS, a shared service of the ADA, implements high-stakes admission/licensure testing programs for the following governing bodies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations (JCNDE)</th>
<th>Council on Dental Education and Licensure (CDEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• National Board Dental Examinations (NBDE)</td>
<td>• Dental Admission Test (DAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Part I</td>
<td>• Advanced Dental Admission Test (ADAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ INBDE (Under development; replaces NBDE Part I (2020) and NBDE Part II (2022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ NBDHE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Clients</th>
<th>ADA Board of Trustees - DLOSCE Steering Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Optometry Admission Test (OAT)</td>
<td>• Dental Licensure Objective Structured Clinical Examination (DLOSCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canadian Dental Admission Test (CDAT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thoughts on Test Security – Industry/Test Security Professional Perspective
Top Threats to Test Validity  (Courtesy of Caveon, LLC)

- Capturing download files or mail booklets
- Photographing test content during the test
- Copying the test session electronically
- Memorizing the test content
- Recording questions verbally
- Receiving the test content from an insider
- Manipulation of testing rules
Top Cheating Threats (Courtesy of Caveon, LLC)

- Using pre-exposure to test content
- Using a proxy
- Receiving assistance during the test
- Using aids during the test
- Tampering with or changing answers or scores
- Copying from someone else during the test
- Manipulation of testing rules
Proxy Testing Example

- 2011 – American College Testing (ACT)
  - 15 high school students arrested in New York
  - Paid proxy examinees between $500 - $3600 to take the ACT and SAT for them
  - New York State legislature held a hearing about ACT and SAT testing program security
    - ACT and SAT require students to provide photographs of themselves as part of the registration process
Policy for Checking-in With a Testing Vendor

- **2 IDs**
  - Primary ID must be non-expired, government-issued and bear a photo and signature. Secondary ID must bear a signature
- **Image Capture Required**
- **Biometrics Required**
  - Fingerprint or Palm Vein
- **Note boards/markers allowed but provided by vendor**
  - Note taking is not allowed before the test begins and during scheduled breaks
Pre-exposure to Test Content Example

• 2010 – American Board of Internal Medicine (ABIM)
  – 140 doctors accused of having acquired or assisted in the attainment of Board certified exams

• 2012 - CNN investigation revealed radiology residents were using “recalls” or large banks of memorized questions
  – Provided by the residency programs

• Encouraged its soon-to-test residents to memorize items to contribute to the recall banks
Acknowledged Rules of Conduct

- You will not give, receive, nor obtain any form of unauthorized assistance prior to the examination, during the examination (e.g. in the testing room or when on break), or subsequent to the examination.
- You will maintain the confidentiality of the examination. You will not reproduce or attempt to reproduce examination materials through memorization, recording, copying, or other means. You will not provide information relating to current examination content that might affect the examination’s ability to accurately reflect candidate skills, or that might provide an unfair advantage to other candidates.
Camera Devices are Strictly Prohibited
Enhanced Security Policies

• All candidates will be required to remove their eyeglasses for close visual inspection by a test administrator.
  – These inspections are done at check-in and again upon returning from breaks
• Jewelry outside of wedding and engagement rings are prohibited
• Hair and/or other accessories are subject to inspection
• Candidates are asked to: pull out their pockets, lift up their pant legs, and roll up their arm sleeves for inspection.
• A proctor will use a wand to search the candidate for any electronic devices
Unauthorized Notes are Prohibited

Step 4: enter your notes... that you just can’t remember.

TI Calculator How-To Series

INPUT NOTES INTO TI-84/83
WITHOUT NOTEFOLIO
Unscheduled Breaks During an Examination

• During an unscheduled break, a candidate may NOT access personal belongings or prohibited items, study or refer to notes or texts, use a telephone, eat food or beverages, or leave the test center.

  – Examination Regulations and Prohibited Conduct
    • 2017 NBDE Part I Guide – Regulation #5, page 30
    • 2017 NBDE Part II Guide – Regulation #5, page 33
    • 2017 NBDHE Guide – Regulation #5, page 34

RED – Candidate has no access to lockers at all
YELLOW – Candidate may only access their locker for food, drink, or medicine
GREEN – Candidate has full access to all belongings in locker
BLUE – For clients with non-standard break policies, Client Practice must be consulted
Security Threats Experienced by DTS

The following is a list of examples of previous threats the Department of Testing Services has experienced that threatens the integrity of our testing programs:

- Forged score report; altered reported results
- Hidden notes, phone, tablet in bathroom
- Unscheduled break violation (notes in car, friend in lobby)
- Falsified identity; tested under sister’s SS# and name
- Falsified score report; never tested
- Physical threat to staff from angry candidates whose results were voided (candidate flew across the country and showed up at ADA demanding to speak to someone)
Impact of Cheating on DTS Testing Programs

- Cost to replace items (often estimated at $2,000+ per item)
- Undermines validity and reliability of testing program
- Increased cost to candidates due to security expenses
- Threatens safety of healthcare provided to public
- Threatens public perception of the healthcare profession
Consequences to Candidates

• Results voided
• Retest penalty; typically one to two years, could even be lifetime ban
• May impact ability to repay student loans
• May delay graduation
• May jeopardize acceptance into post-graduate program
• May jeopardize licensure
Irregularity and Appeal Process
Definition of Irregularity

• An irregularity is defined as a situation in which there could be a question about the validity of examination results in accurately reflecting the ability and skills of a candidate.
Examples of an Irregularity

• Reasons for withholding scores include, but are not limited to:
  – Unusual answer patterns
  – Atypical score increases from one examination attempt to another
  – Inconsistent performance on different parts of a test
  – Improper access to secure test content
  – Test administration irregularity
  – Falsification of personal identification, application information, or supporting documents
  – Violation of rules and regulations
  – Falsification of score report
  – Information indicating the results might not be valid

* Areas with the most irregularities appear in green
Irregularity Process
Step One: Report of Irregularity or Request for Appeal

- Testing vendor irregularity report (rule or regulation violation)
- Policy Appeal (examples: 5 time/5 year and 90 day retest)
- Anonymous tips, routine audit procedures
- Supporting documentation gathered and assembled into packets
Irregularity Process
Step Two: Violation confirmed; Notification Sent

- Candidate has 30 days to submit an appeal upon notification of a violation (Limited Right of Appeal for Examination Candidates)
- Protocol regarding when results are withheld, voided, or another appropriate penalty
- Reported results may be voided, unreleased results will be withheld pending resolution of appeal
Sample Violation Notification

This is concerning the administration of the [name of examination] on [date]. The test center reported that you [violation - accessed your locker during an unscheduled break]. This violates the Examination Regulations and Prohibited Conduct (regulation [#], page [#]) section of the enclosed [examination guide].

As a consequence of this violation, the JCNDE has voided your [date] [examination] results. You will have to wait [12 months] from the date of your examination, until [date], before you can retest.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must submit the request in writing within 30 days of receiving this notice. An appeal request should include any supporting documentation and must also include a statement of the action you seek. The decision on a request for appeal will be communicated to you within 60 days after we receive the request. Additional information about appeals is included in the enclosed copy of the JCNDE’s Limited Right of Appeal for Examination Candidates.

All matters relative to the irregularity and appeal process must be conducted in writing.
The Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations (JCNDE) recognizes that strict application of the Examination Regulations for National Board Examinations may, because of unusual circumstances, impose an unusual burden on one or more candidates. In these situations, the JCNDE may consider an appeal.

Requests for an appeal pertaining to test results must be initiated within 30 days of receiving test results or, in the case of withheld results, within 30 days of receiving written notice that results are being withheld. In the event that the JCNDE has given notice that previously released results are to be invalidated or voided, the request for appeal must be submitted within 30 days of that notice. In this case, a request for appeal will stay the action to invalidate or void the results until such time as the appeal is decided or the time for submitting a request for appeal has expired. A request for an appeal must be submitted in writing and must include adequate supporting documentation. The request for an appeal must indicate the specific relief requested.

A request for an appeal will first be screened by the Chair, in consultation with the secretary. The Chair, at his/her sole discretion, may 1) grant the appeal, 2) deny the appeal, or 3) forward the appeal to the full Joint Commission for its consideration. If during the Joint Commission’s deliberations credible information becomes available indicating an error was made in the decision to withhold scores, the Chair in consultation with the secretary may end the deliberations and grant the appeal. At his or her discretion, the Chair may delegate the screening of appeals to another member of the Joint Commission.

In rendering a decision with respect to appeals—and particularly in situations where results have been withheld—the touchstone and foremost consideration is the validity of examination results, in alignment with the purpose of the examination. The Joint Commission strives to be fair and objective in its decision making process, as it remains true to its mission. When considering appeals, the JCNDE avoids favoritism and strives to ensure that all candidates are treated equally and fairly.

If the issue presented in an appeal is likely to recur, the JCNDE may consider a change in its Examination Regulations. The granting of an appeal will be considered a precedent only if a change in regulations is also adopted. The candidate will be notified of JCNDE action within 60 days after receipt of the written request for an appeal.
• If candidate submits an appeal, packet is forwarded to the JCNDE Chair for review. The Chair grants, denies, or forwards to the membership for ballot.
Irregularity Process
Step Four: Decision Letter

- Candidate is provided written notification of decision (response deadline is 60 days from receipt of appeal)
- If the appeal is denied or no appeal is filed, results will be voided, or other appropriate sanctions imposed. Alternatively, when a failing score has been obtained, the examination program may elect to report the failing score
Thoughts on Test Security – School/University Perspective

Dr. Frank William Licari, DDS, MPH, MBA
# DTS Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN</strong></td>
<td>David M. Waldschmidt, Ph.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waldschmidtd@ada.org">waldschmidtd@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Test Development</td>
<td>Kathleen J. Hinshaw, L.D.H., Ed.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hinshawk@ada.org">hinshawk@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Volunteers &amp; Meetings</td>
<td>Alexis Curtis, BA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:curtisa@ada.org">curtisa@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Test Administration</td>
<td>Nicholas B. Hussong, MA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hussongn@ada.org">hussongn@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Research &amp; Development - Psychometrics</td>
<td>Chien-Lin Yang, Ph.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yangc@ada.org">yangc@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, DTS Communications</td>
<td>Alix Katznelson, BA, BS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katznelson@ada.org">katznelson@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Client Services &amp; Special Projects</td>
<td>Ellen J. Ryske, MBA, PMP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryskee@ada.org">ryskee@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, New Psychometric Development &amp; Innovations</td>
<td>Matthew Grady, Ph.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gradym@ada.org">gradym@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Test Security &amp; Fraud Prevention</td>
<td>Bryan Svendby, MA, SSCP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:svendbyb@ada.org">svendbyb@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, DTS</td>
<td>Sara Green, BA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greens@ada.org">greens@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, DTS Meetings</td>
<td>Betsey Palmer, BA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:palmerb@ada.org">palmerb@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator General Counsel</td>
<td>Cathy Albrecht, Esq.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:albreachtc@ada.org">albreachtc@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator General Counsel</td>
<td>Betsey Palmer, BA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:palmerb@ada.org">palmerb@ada.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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