ABIM MOC Evaluation and Feedback Requirements and Examples

Component	Requirement	Expectation
Evaluation Mechanism	All activities, including live activities, must include a comprehensive evaluation component that assesses individual learner competence, knowledge and/or skill.	The evaluation measures the competence or performance of the individual learner and not of the activity. Evaluation methods employed should be able to identify individual learning (not anonymous).
Participation Threshold	The provider determines and communicates the participation threshold, also known as a passing standard, for the learner to earn MOC credit.	The participation threshold must be clearly communicated to the learner prior to engagement in the activity. The learner must meet the participation threshold set by the provider before credit is reported.
Feedback	All activities must include feedback to participants, identifying learner results with rationales for correct answers or attainment of applicable skill(s), and/or relevant citations where appropriate.	Evaluation of the learner and feedback to the learner must be completed before completion credit may be awarded.

Important Tips:

- The accredited provider may choose to evaluate the activity at the session level or at the activity level.
- The provider does not need to be limited to a single method of evaluation per activity. Combinations of approaches to evaluation may produce valuable information about learner change.
- The accredited provider determines the passing standard/participation threshold of the evaluation and can give instructions to their learners about what they need to do in order to earn MOC credit.
- The accredited provider must be able to demonstrate that the learner has engaged in the evaluation for the educational activity and met the threshold to earn MOC credit.
- If the activity is selected for audit, the accredited provider will be asked to submit the evaluation mechanism, a description of how the evaluation was implemented and how feedback was provided to learners, and a list of the physician learners who met the minimum participation threshold. This does not need to include the answers submitted by learners.
- Learner completion data should be reported into PARS after the learner has participated in the evaluation, met the participation threshold, and received feedback. The general expectation by the boards is that learners will be submitted into PARS no more than 30 days after they complete the evaluation so learners can see their MOC credit reflected.

Mechanism	Evaluation Method	Participation Threshold	Feedback Method
Case Discussion	Learners asked to share with each other and group how they would approach the case at various stages.	Learner actively participates in the conversation as judged by a group leader or observer.	The outcome of the case is shared.
Written responses	Learners write down what they have learned and indicate commitment to change or maintain an element of practice.	Learner writes a reflective statement and makes a commitment to change or maintain an element of practice.	Leader/facilitator summarizes what was discussed and best next steps for learners.
Audience response system	Learners select answers to provocative questions using the ARS. The ARS must be traceable to the individual.	Learners engage adequately with an acceptable number of attempts. Threshold set by provider.	Answer to each question is shared in dialog or writing, including rationale for correct answers with relevant citations.
Quiz	Learners complete answers to a quiz during or after an activity.	Percent of correct answers set by provider.	Best answer to each question is discussed or shared, including rationale for correct answers with relevant citations.
Table-top exercise	Learners write down next steps in an evolving case at various set points.	Learner writes a possible next step to each question.	Best practice at each step is discussed or shared after each set point.
Simulation	Learners demonstrate strategy/skill in a simulated setting—could be role-play or formal simulation lab.	Learner participates in simulation as judged by a facilitator or observer.	Best practice or technique is discussed and shared throughout, or at the conclusion of the simulation
Review of manuscript	Learners provide constructive feedback on the manuscript according to the specifications of the journal.	Acceptable quality of the manuscript review is determined by the editor.	Editor provides feedback on the adequacy of the review to the learner.
Writing test items	Learners write test items that are evaluated by committee chair and peers.	Item quality is adequate as determined by committee chair.	Feedback is received from peers and committee chair throughout the writing process.
Learning from teaching	Identification by the teacher (who is the learner in this instance) of knowledge gaps that need to be filled in order to teach the material.	A reflective evaluation by the teacher/learner identifying ways in which the knowledge gaps were filled.	Structured, documented feedback provided to teacher by a mentor or peer upon review of the gap and the identified learning.

Accredited providers have asked for examples that would illustrate the use of reflective statements as the mechanism for evaluation in large, live activities. Please note these examples are for illustrative purposes only and are not meant to be the only way that reflective statements might be used either alone or as part of a broader evaluation mechanism.

Example 1: The provider plans a multi-day, large live activity that includes a wide variety of sessions (e.g., case discussion, didactic, skills-training). In the case discussion and skills-training sessions, facilitators manage the discussion/training and record those learners who demonstrate meaningful participation. To assess learning overall for the activity, learners are asked to keep a learning journal and are given time at the start of each session to record their intended learning goals, learning points achieved, and an intent to

change as a result of the activity. The learning journals are reviewed for completeness and suggested resources are provided back to the learners.

Example 2: A provider convenes a live meeting to optimize communication with patients, with peers, and with students. Each learner self-identifies the theme that they seek to pursue (such as optimal communication with patients) from the meeting agenda and completes a digital diary as they learn through the activity. Those statements are reviewed for appropriateness and inadequate reflective statements are remediated.

Example 3: A provider plans a large annual meeting with a range of content related to a specific specialty field. The meeting has tracks that help learners select the sessions that meet their own learning needs. Learners are asked to write one or more reflective statements linking their own needs with the content in the track. Key faculty from each track review the reflective statements for appropriateness and provide feedback to individual learners.

Example 4: A provider plans a large annual meeting with a range of content related to a specific specialty field. Learners are asked to choose 10 sessions reflective of their top learning priorities and to keep track of at least one key learning point from each of the sessions. Toward the end of the meeting, a special homeroom-style session is held where learners share their top patient problems, their key learning points, and discuss with their colleagues. Faculty members review learning points and attest to engagement.

Example 5: The provider develops a 3-day workshop focused on improving quality of care for children with chronic musculoskeletal disability. The program includes a didactic focus on management of acute rheumatologic presentations, a series of case presentations, and a skill development program about effective application of orthopedic casts. The participation of the learners in the program is verified, and learners are asked to complete a series of reflective statements about what they learned and what they will change. Those statements are reviewed for appropriateness and inadequate reflective statements are remediated.

Example 6: A provider convenes a half-day live program focused on optimizing palliative care that includes a variety of case presentations, discussions, and interviews with patients. At the conclusion of the activity, learners are provided with the learning objectives for the activity and asked to document their own reflective statements and intent to change. The group reconvenes to discuss and share what they wrote for these statements and give feedback to each other; a facilitator confirms that each learner engaged and participated in this discussion and peer-feedback.