The purpose of TESTPOINTS® is to share with the various optometric communities the news, events, and changes that are happening at the National Board of Examiners in Optometry (NBEO). Please send any comments or questions that you may have to info@optometry.org. Your submissions may be chosen for response in our Letters to the Editor section.
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Dr. Nancy Peterson-Klein Welcomed as President of the NBEO Board of Directors

Dr. Nancy Peterson-Klein was elected as President of the National Board of Examiners in Optometry at the December 2011 meeting. Dr. Peterson-Klein joined the Board in 2008 and has served as its vice president and secretary/treasurer. She was appointed Interim Dean of the Michigan College of Optometry at Ferris State University in 2007, in addition to her service to the college as Associate Dean of Student and Academic Affairs. She also served in many other administrative positions, to include Director of External Clinical Rotations, Director of Residency Programs, and Director of Primary Care Service.

Under Dr. Peterson-Klein’s leadership as Interim Dean, the college was granted a $26.9 million capital outlay grant from the State of Michigan to design, develop, and establish plans for a new Michigan College of Optometry facility to house the Doctor of Optometry educational program. The new 87,000-square-foot facility was completed in 2010 and is comprised of a 36,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art clinical space called the University Eye Center; innovative eye learning laboratory spaces; and distant learning and high-tech presentation classrooms. This innovative new home for MCO provides a 21st-century facility for the faculty, staff, students, and the patients they serve.
After receiving a Doctor of Optometry degree from The Ohio State University in 1969, Dr. Peterson-Klein joined the faculty at TOSU and subsequently became the first optometric consultant for Ohio Vision Service Plan. She served as a liaison between over 600 optometrists and VSP staff on all optometric issues relating to the visual well-being of VSP subscribers. She joined the faculty at Ferris State University in 1977 and moved through the academic ranks to become Professor in 1996 at the Michigan College of Optometry. As a faculty member, she provided clinical care to patients in primary care, low vision rehabilitation, contact lens, pediatric services, and gave classroom and laboratory instruction in clinical and binocular diagnostic procedures courses. She was instrumental in establishing Web seminar learning courses within the curriculum and in establishing real-time case study discussions with off-campus, fourth-year professional students. She was also an invited faculty member of the Institute of Health Science at the Ramkhamhaeng University in Bangkok, Thailand where she provided clinical seminars, workshops, and clinical supervision to third- and fourth-year optometry students.

Included among Dr. Peterson-Klein’s areas of academic specialization are the diagnosis of binocular vision anomalies, cornea and contact lenses, and educational methodology. She has authored or co-authored and presented more than 70 papers, abstracts, and educational presentations.

Dr. Peterson-Klein served as Chair of the Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry (ASCO) Clinic Directors/Administrators Special Interest Group (SIG) in 2008-9 and was instrumental in the formation of the ASCO SIG for Externship Directors. She also was an invited faculty member of three of the ASCO Summer Institutes for Faculty Development and served as the keynote speaker in 2011.

As a Fellow of the American Academy of Optometry, Dr. Peterson-Klein served for 10 years as Admittance Committee Chair for Region 3 of the AAO. She has been an active member of the American and Michigan Optometric Association for over 47 years. She currently serves as Secretary of the Michigan Foundation for Vision Awareness.

Dr. Peterson-Klein retired in 2010 after 41 years of service to optometric education. She is married to Dr. Matthew Klein, Dean Emeritus of the College of Arts & Sciences at Ferris State University. They have two daughters and two sons.

A Message from the President of the NBEO Board of Directors

Every optometry candidate taking the National Board of Optometry examinations is familiar with the following important and critical statement: “I will uphold and honorably promote by example and action the highest standard, ethics, and ideals of my chosen profession and the honor of the degree, Doctor of Optometry, which has been granted me.” Further, the state licensing boards of optometry, which require passage of NBEO examinations for licensure, expect each candidate taking the entry level examinations to adhere to the optometric oath of practice that includes these ethical statements.

The Board of Directors of the NBEO recognizes and understands the criticality of the basis of the Optometric Oath as it supports the mission of National Board of Examiners, which is to protect the public health and safety by ensuring competence among the candidate population that passes NBEO exams. The National Board examinations must be valid and reliable in order to obtain an accurate assessment of a candidate’s knowledge base and clinical competence.

To protect the integrity of the examinations, the Board of Directors has a zero tolerance policy with respect to cheating or any academic dishonesty at any point before, during, or after NBEO examinations. An updated NBEO Ethics Policy is nearing completion and will be posted to the NBEO website in the very near future. The enhanced policy will more clearly define the attitudes, behaviors, and responsibilities of ethical candidates who take the National Board Examinations. Contained within this edition of TestPoints is an article entitled, “NBEO, Others Affected by Cheating Concerns,” that is based on contemporary ethical dilemmas in various academic arenas across the country. The article’s intent is to explain the need for the new NBEO Ethics Policy.

Candidates are asked to check back for the updated NBEO Ethics Policy, and the Candidate Exam Conduct and Exam Security Agreement, and forward any specific questions you may have regarding the ethics policy to the Executive Director, Jack E. Terry, O.D., Ph.D. (nb eo@optometry.org).

“The National Board of Examiners in Optometry Board of Directors continues to be forward-thinking in meeting the mission of the NBEO and hopes to achieve full candidate cooperation in this effort. The BOD requests that candidates check back for and then regularly review the updated NBEO’s Ethics Policy and the Candidate Exam Conduct and Exam Security Agreement. Any specific questions that candidates may have regarding the new ethics policy, once posted, may be brought to the attention of Dr. Jack E. Terry, NBEO Executive Director.”

--- Dr. Nancy Peterson-Klein, 2012 President of the NBEO Board of Directors
Changes to the Part II PAM Examination:

- As was announced in the Fall 2011 issue of TestPoints, beginning in April 2012, the Part II PAM examination will be administered in a computer-based testing (CBT) format. The NBEO has contracted with Pearson VUE for computerized testing services. Pearson VUE's extensive network of more than 200 test centers provides relatively easy access for all candidates to sit for the exam.
- An interactive tutorial has been posted on the NBEO website, allowing candidates to become familiar with the features of the CBT format.
- The Part II PAM examination consists of 60 patient cases with a total of 350 items. The exam is divided into two sessions, each with 30 patient cases and 175 associated items.
- The PAM exam will be administered in two 3.5-hour sessions, with an optional break of up to 45 minutes between the morning and afternoon sessions.

Changes to the TMOD Examination:

- The change to computer-based testing enables the NBEO to offer the Treatment and Management of Ocular Disease (TMOD) examination as a separate examination for those candidates who require a TMOD-only score.
- The TMOD exam will be comprised of those cases on the PAM examination that contain 1 or more TMOD items. The cases will be presented in their entirety, but only the TMOD items will be scored.
- The TMOD exam will be administered in a single 4-hour session on the same day as the PAM examination.

Multiple-Response (MR) Items:

- Approximately 10% of the items on the PAM and TMOD exams are multiple-response (MR) items.
- MR items made their NBEO debut on the 2011 Part I ABS examination.
- Click [HERE](#) for more information about MR items.

Registration for Upcoming Part II PAM and TMOD Examinations:

- Registration for the April 2012 administration of the Part II PAM and TMOD examinations is now closed.
- Registration for the December 2012 administration of both exams is expected to open in June. Please periodically check the News and Notes section of the NBEO website for updated information about registration.

Part II PAM and TMOD Examinations Information:

- Additional information about the Part II PAM and TMOD exams can be viewed on the NBEO website (click [HERE](#)) under the PAM / TMOD tab.
- The Pearson VUE website offers information about the CBT test centers and the exam-day experience [HERE](#).

**The November 29, 2011 Part II PAM / TMOD examination was the final paper-and-pencil PAM / TMOD exam. Starting in April 2012, the Part II PAM and TMOD examinations will be administered in CBT format, through Pearson VUE. In addition, the TMOD exam will be offered as a separate test for candidates who require only a TMOD score.**

### Injections Skill Examination (ISE) Inclusion in Part III CSE Score

Beginning in August 2012, the Injections Skill Examination (ISE) score will be included as a permanent, regular, required segment of the overall Part III Clinical Skills Examination (CSE) score. The Injections Skill score will become a standard component of the Station 4 score.

The voluntary pilot ISE program ran from 2007 to 2010 in conjunction with the twice-yearly Part III clinical skills exams. In the final, traditional, multi-site Part III CSE administration in April 2011, the ISE was given as an elective part of the CSE; the ISE score was separate from the CSE score and was not included in the CSE score. From August 2011 to July 2012, the ISE is a required, separate, scored part of the CSE but the score is not incorporated into the overall CSE score. When the new academic year begins in August 2012 (for the targeted Class of 2013), Part III candidates will take the ISE as a regular section of the CSE, and their ISE scores will be included within their total, final Part III CSE scores, just as all other skill scores are included in the final CSE score.

Though points accumulated in the Injections Skill will become a routine part of the total CSE score in August 2012, ISE scores will remain, for some time, a break-out score similar to TMOD scores. This is because over time, just as certain current, licensed practitioners have experienced the need to acquire a TMOD score at some point in their professional careers, some licensed ODs will find that they need an ISE score to satisfy updated state licensure requirements.
ADA Disability Test Accommodation Rules
Adapt to New CBT PAM / TMOD Exam Registration Process

The Part II PAM and TMOD examinations now involve a 2-step sign-up process. First, exam candidates register with the NBEO. Second, they schedule an exam seat at the Pearson VUE center where they will take the exam. Because PAM/TMOD sign-up must occur in this order, it has become apparent that additional time between application for ADA disability test accommodation and Pearson VUE scheduling is needed. Pearson VUE is unable to schedule an exam seat for a candidate until AFTER the candidate and NBEO have completed the test accommodation process and an accommodation has been assigned.

For the yearly December Part II PAM and TMOD exam administrations ONLY (not for the yearly April PAM exams), Pearson VUE will hold seats until 60 days before the test date. After that date, seats will be offered to the general public for use for other exams. Therefore, it is in all NBEO candidates’ best interest to arrange for a December PAM/TMOD Pearson VUE seat before the 60-day-out release date. The earliest possible registration with NBEO and subsequent scheduling for a December Pearson VUE appointment are recommended, even within the 60-day-out time interval. This is due to competition for seats among all NBEO candidates, which may affect a candidate’s ability to sign up for his/her preferred CBT location.

Because of the Pearson VUE seat availability issue, it is of special interest to candidates with ADA disabilities to navigate the accommodation process EARLY. To assist in ensuring that ADA-disabled candidates have an optimal chance to schedule PAM or TMOD seats in their desired Pearson VUE locations, the ADA application expiration date has been moved back to 13 weeks before the PAM/TMOD exam date. This will allow ample time for the ADA process to take place. The steps through which test accommodations are assigned include the following:

- The candidate registers for the appropriate NBEO exam through the online NBEO website registration page.
- The candidate requests test accommodation and arranges for the initial submission of disability documentation that justifies the requested accommodation.
- The NBEO promptly acquires a professional, expert, external review of all case materials (this step can take as long as 10 days).
- The NBEO assesses all case materials, including the assessment from the external reviewer.
- The NBEO asks the candidate for any needed additional disability documentation.
- The candidate arranges for the existing requested records to be sent to NBEO or acquires the additional information and has it sent to NBEO.
- The NBEO reviews the completed case file, determines qualification for accommodation, and informs the candidate of the accommodation decision.
  - Occasionally, a request is denied, in which case the candidate may submit a staff-level appeal, with new documentation.
  - The new documents may be sent to the expert external reviewer for evaluation and recommendations, which may take up to 10 days.
  - NBEO staff evaluates all appeal/case materials, makes a decision, and informs the candidate.
    - Very rarely, a staff-level appeal is denied, in which case the candidate may submit a judicial-level appeal, with additional new documentation.
    - These additional new documents may be sent to the expert external reviewer for evaluation and recommendations, which may take up to 10 days.
    - The Board of Directors Judicial Committee convenes and evaluates all appeal/case materials, makes a final decision; and NBEO staff informs the candidate.
    - As soon as the candidate receives notification of the decision, the candidate may contact Pearson VUE to schedule an exam seat appointment before the 60-day-out date deadline has passed.

Candidates with non-ADA-type disabilities must apply for test accommodation within 28 days of the PAM or TMOD exam test date due to the temporary, recent-onset nature of such disabilities (click HERE for a definition of the distinction between ADA and non-ADA-type limitations). Because the Pearson VUE exam seat already will have been acquired before non-ADA-type requests are submitted, and Pearson VUE requires that accommodations are assigned prior to such seat assignment, the NBEO will strive to accommodate these candidates as well as circumstances permit.

When a candidate receives ADA test accommodation from the NBEO for the PAM or TMOD examinations:

- The NBEO will prepare an approval letter and accommodation agreement and email them to the candidate.
- The candidate will be advised to sign the agreement and to fax it back to the NBEO as soon as possible.
- As soon as the signed agreement is returned to the NBEO, Pearson VUE will be notified of the assigned accommodation.
- The candidate will be informed that notification was sent to Pearson VUE.
- The candidate will be advised to contact Pearson VUE to acquire the exam seat at his/her earliest convenience.

Click HERE to view detailed ADA disability and non-ADA-type disability test accommodation information and instructions on the NBEO website.
There will be a Reunion/Appreciation Luncheon for the NBEO Part III Clinical Skills Examination Examiners before this year’s AOA Meeting in Chicago. The gathering is set for Tuesday, June 26th from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency McCormick Place.

Invitations to this function were sent out to all of our Examiners. If you should have been on the list but did not receive your invitation, we most likely do not have your current email address. If you didn’t receive the emailed invitation but have served as an NBEO Examiner and plan on attending, please RSVP no later than March 15, 2012 by emailing us at nbeo@optometry.org or by clicking HERE (the Username/Password are the same ones that you used to register to become an Examiner).

We look forward to visiting with you in Chicago!

---

**November 2011 Part II Pam Exam Score Statistics**

*The Part II Patient Assessment and Management (PAM) Examination was given on November 29, 2011. A total of 1,478 candidates took the exam; 1,366 passed the exam. The result was a pass rate of 92.4%.*

*Of the 1,478 candidates who sat for PAM, 1,418 were students taking Part II for the first time; 1350 passed, for a 95.2% pass rate. Among the 60 repeat PAM test-takers, 16 passed the exam, resulting in a 26.7% pass rate.*

The graph presents the distribution of total scaled scores for the November 29, 2011 Part II PAM exam, in 50-point increments (x-axis). The figure is labeled with the number of scores within each increment (y-axis). The 550-point increment demonstrated the highest frequency, with over 250 candidates scoring at this level. For this administration, 15 candidates received scaled scores of 100, the lowest possible scaled score.

The scaled score range for each NBEO Part is based on a 100-900 scale, where 100 represents the lowest score, and 900 represents a perfect score. In addition, Part pass-fail cutoff scores are scaled so that they always equal 300. In cases where the scaling procedure results in a raw score being converted to a score of less than 100, a scaled score of 100 is assigned.
Cheating before, during, and after test taking has become a challenge for all testing agencies, at all educational levels. Contemporary overachievers, from grade school through high school through college through national, high-stakes, board-level examinations feel great pressure to come out on top of the game and get where they wish to go. Unfortunately, some test-takers may view cheating as a normal, acceptable way of life rather than the unethical, often-illegal activity that it is.

Contemporary life involves so many different types of “cheating” that the line of demarcation has become fuzzy and is easy to ignore. “Everybody does it” is a common response to any discussion about cheating. Who hasn’t stolen music, images, or text from online sources with little regard for those from whom these entities were copied? The Internet age so routinely facilitates copying that the notion of plagiarism has more or less disappeared from the collective radar. Few individuals are caught and prosecuted following even significant acts of Internet theft, which leaves little incentive to buy music, or to write one’s own text, or effectively, to permanently learn information for an impending board-level examination as opposed to mere cramming of copied exam items, which results in a more temporary, incomplete knowledge base. According to Mark Bauerlein’s New York Times article1 from July 12, 2010, knowledge too often is not absorbed and interpreted. “It is retrieved and passed along so speedily that students forget it an hour later. Sad to say, too many college teachers accept the trend. It’s the 21st century, they shrug, and the last thing they want is to appear behind the times.”

The NBEO becomes involved in the world of contemporary cheating against its will, when its exam takers choose to pirate National Board exam items. Psychometrically sound exam questions and answers are too difficult and expensive to create to look the other way when cheating schemes are discovered and simply to allow the practice to continue. Beyond the considerable value of exam items, the ultimate reason the National Board refuses to ignore cheating relates to the public’s health and welfare. These entities are far better protected if exam items truly test candidates’ knowledge rather than testing how effectively students can imbibe the limited information contained within study guides replete with exam items that were copied, and thus pirated, by previous board exam candidates following their exam administrations.

Reliance on the study of compiled exam items tends to inhibit true learning of critically important material. Rather, this type of study typically leads to a shallow grasp of information that is largely forgotten once the exam is taken. This does not yield an acceptable scholastic outcome for anyone, least of all, members of the general public who seek professional, knowledgeable eye and vision care from their licensed optometrists.

A host of commentary regarding contemporary cheating in multiple forms has been seen or heard over the past several years within the pages of newspapers, radio news blurbs, Internet articles, and TV newscasts. Mark Bauerlein, in this same New York Times article, reported that:

- The Benenson Strategy Group Survey (2009) polled a group of 7th-12th graders and found that:
  - 35% admitted to cheating by cell phone during a test.
  - 25% texted answers.
  - 20% searched the Internet on their phones.
  - 52% admitted to Web-based cheating of one kind or another, but many felt that this did not constitute cheating.
  - 50% identified phone-cheating during a test as a “serious offense.”
  - 33% saw no harm in downloading a paper.
  - 42% deemed copying text from websites as “minor” or entirely okay.

- The Atlanta-Journal Constitution’s reporter, Heather Vogell, educated the public about public school educators in Atlanta, Georgia in her story of July 6, 2011.2
  - In Atlanta, Georgia, there was a massive, widespread, decade-long scheme to alter students’ state standardized test responses to improve their scores. Many top school system administrators, staff, teachers, and principals pitched in to manually erase students’ wrong answers and replace them with correct answers, sometimes using a transparent plastic answer key to facilitate the process.
  - Whistle-blowers were suppressed. School district employees who wished to expose the fraud did not do so out of fear of retaliation.
  - Bonuses were given to those who created the best scores.
  - Proof of wrongdoing was destroyed, altered, buried, or ignored by those who instead, should have uncovered and revealed the cheating and immediately put an end to it.
• CNN’s AC360° Special Investigations Unit reporters Zamost, Griffin, and Ansari investigated cheating that was discovered among radiology residents. It has been a long-standing tradition among these residents to memorize test questions that were incorporated into what was termed “recalls.” The story received widespread notice during the AC360° TV show of January 13, 2012:
  o Dr. Gary Becker, executive director of the American Board of Radiology (ABR), shared that the use of “recalls” has been “going on a long time, I know, but I can’t give you a date … We would call it cheating, and our exam security policy would call it cheating.”
  o All radiology residents must sign an agreement before taking their board exam that prohibits the sharing of test materials, but the CNN reporters found that the agreement is ignored by many radiology exam candidates.
  o The sharing of exam items is so prevalent and is regarded as such a significant problem within the medical community that the ABR has posted on its website a strongly worded video warning to residents that the use of recalls must stop. Dr. Becker goes on to say, “Questions and answers have been memorized, sometimes verbatim, and contributed to extensive archives of old ABR test material that become the prize possessions of many residency programs. Accumulating and studying from lists of questions on prior examinations constitutes unauthorized access, is inappropriate, unnecessary, intolerable and illegal.”
  o Dr. Matthew Webb, an Army captain at the San Antonio Uniformed Services Health Education Consortium (SAUSHEC), an Army/Air Force program, was willing to speak with CNN about the recalls. He said, “Cheating is the ultimate betrayal of trust to patients, and it’s also the most egregious and flagrant violation in academia. I got to where I was based on my own personal achievements, learning and educating myself. To have to take an exam up against others who have been cheating is unfathomable.” Dr. Webb alerted the ABR about the use of recalls, after which the ABR initiated and sustained an in-depth investigation. Dr. Webb explained how the program director for whom he worked insisted that recalls have to be used in order to pass parts of the ABR exam. Webb refused to do so, stating that, “Sir I believe that is cheating. I don’t believe in that. I can do it on my own.” Webb also stated that, “This is not a gray area. This is absolute, definitive cheating. If we were in middle school, high school, college or anywhere else in academia, they would call it cheating.”
  o As a result of Dr. Webb’s honest reporting of the unfortunate reality in radiology testing, Dr. Becker of the ABR commented on the use of recalls, “We’re outraged by this, and we took this case to our professionalism committee. The results of the deliberations there and the decision of the board was to go directly back to the training director, the dean of the institution, and we’ve had those discussions.”
  o As is the main concern for all healthcare profession testing agencies, the ABR’s President-Elect pointed out that the ABR’s “real mission is to the public … to say that your certified radiologist has demonstrated, acquired and maintained the requisite skills and knowledge to practice with skill and safety on the public.”

• Also brought to light in this January 13, 2012 CNN AC360° Special Investigations Unit story was a short segment about the American Board of Internal Medicine’s reaction to pirated exam items:
  o In 2010, the American Board of Internal Medicine suspended 139 doctors for sharing test questions with an exam review company.
  o Dr. Christine Cassel, President and CEO of the American Board of Internal Medicine, said, “Sharing test questions from memory is a serious problem that threatens the integrity of all standardized testing. Test takers need to know that this kind of ‘brain dumping’ is grossly unethical and the American Board of Internal Medicine will not tolerate unethical behavior from physicians seeking board certification. ABIM will take appropriate action against anyone who seeks to compromise the integrity of our examinations.”

• CNN’s AC360° Special Investigations Unit reporters Zamost, Griffin, and Ansari also confirmed during a February 6, 2012 broadcast that dermatology residents also have boosted their board-exam scores for many years by sharing exam items:
  o In an anonymous 2008 email to the American Board of Dermatology, a resident shared that, “The board needs to know that there is an organized effort year after year to, by verbatim, reproduce each and every question of the official ABD certifying examination minutes after its completion. So-called ‘airplane notes’ … are well known to dermatology residents and are compiled, typed up and quietly distributed among residency programs across the country.” The compiled notes are known as “airplane notes” because exam takers record as many questions and answers as they can remember after taking their exams and then sit on aircraft as they return home. The board has warned residents that using “airplane notes” is illegal, because test questions are copyrighted.
  o In this same email, the resident shared that, “Each year, minutes after the certifying exam is complete, there is an almost ceremonial meeting of examinees at a local hotel or restaurant there in Chicago. A feverish and collective effort is made by examinees from many programs to reproduce on paper as many questions as they can – verbatim – that they had just encountered … these are even professionally bound at Kinko’s at times.”
In a response to the 2008 e-mail, the board’s executive director, Dr. Antoinette Hood, wrote: “…this practice is unethical and violates our professionalism and ethical standards, which are the basis for the trust given us by our patients …”

It is stated on the American Board of Medical Specialties website that, “It should be made abundantly clear that recalling and sharing questions from exams violates exam security, professional ethics and patient trust in the medical profession. When it happens, the practice should be addressed swiftly and decisively. Whether someone is providing or using test questions, ABMS Member Boards enforce sanctions that may include permanent barring from certification, and/or prosecution for copyright violation.”

- In Great Neck, New York, a different type of cheating has been the focus of news stories. Reporters Jenny Anderson and Peter Applebome, in the December 1, 2011 New York Times, wrote about cheating on Long Island:
  - Five kids from affluent families paid up to $3,600 for stand-in students to sit for their SAT and ACT exams. Prosecutors, principals, parents, and teenagers on Long Island’s Gold Coast knew that, “… it was common knowledge at some of the nation’s most prestigious high schools that if you had the money, you could find someone with a sharper vocabulary and a surer grasp of geometry to fill in the blanks for you.”
  - One 2010 Great Neck North graduate is accused of taking college entrance exams for at least 15 students. His skills included the generation of fake ID cards. He permitted his customers to pay for his services in installments, and he based his fees on what clients could afford. The SAT and ACT scores that he generated for his clients were reputed to be excellent.

- CNYcentral.com posted an article on January 25, 2012, following discovery of the Great Neck, New York cheating scandal, that it was announced that legislators in New York are considering making it a felony to cheat on the SAT college entrance exam. The new felony charge would target those who scheme to facilitate educational testing fraud, including those who impersonate others to take an exam:
  - Various methods are being explored to control exam candidate impersonations, such as fingerprinting, retinal scans, and of course, photo identification.
  - According to this Associated Press news source, Senator Kenneth LaValle of Suffolk County, New York proposed the legislation in the hopes of leading the way nationally toward stamping out cheating-for-pay schemes. Due to the large number of New York students who take the SAT and similar tests, any changes to the exams in New York State likely would result in changes across the country.
  - Senator LaValle likened the Great Neck cheating scandal to the Penn State and Syracuse University sex abuse cases.

Over time, it seems unavoidable that the increased costs to combat various modes of cheating on a multitude of high-stakes examinations will lead to higher examination fees, from basic college entrance tests to board-level exams. Security measures required to prevent cheating during high-stakes examinations will not be inexpensive.

In addition and specific to the NBEO, stolen exam items that must be “retired” once they become “public” will have to be replaced in order to continue to serve the general public ocular and vision welfare. The development of valid, new exam questions and answers will involve multiple, high-cost meetings that are not included in the National Board’s standard operating budget. These extra meetings will be several days in duration and will necessitate significant expenditures for airfare, hotel stays, meals, and subject matter expert honoraria. The significant financial outlays due to exam security breaches ultimately may be reflected in higher examination fees.

The NBEO Ethics Policy and Candidate Agreement are being updated to address the growing trend toward cheating that, according to a multitude of recent news stories, appears to be taking place in American society. It is hoped that these documents will usher the way back toward a more ethical attitude regarding the taking of NBEO examinations. All NBEO exam candidates are asked to proceed through their optometric educations, from orientation to graduation, in a wholly ethical manner and to avoid the temptation and opportunities to cheat before, during, and after their NBEO board-level exams.
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**Did You Know … ???**

- … that Part III CSE candidates should plan to arrive at the National Center of Clinical Testing in Optometry (NCCTO) no earlier than 15 minutes before their scheduled appointments, allowing adequate time for traffic and weather delays if driving to the test center? Candidates cannot be admitted to the NCCTO more than 15 minutes in advance of their appointment times. Candidates who arrive earlier than necessary may choose to visit the Overstreet Mall on Floor 3 of the BB&T Building where they may find casual dining and limited shopping opportunities, depending on the day and time of their visit. Most restaurants/shops are closed on Saturdays.

- … that the calendar application process for stand-alone Injections Skill Exam (ISE) registration is now complete? The ISE registration and scheduling/re-scheduling procedure is similar to the CSE process. The ISE is available to existing practitioners as a stand-alone exam, separate from the CSE. Availability is similar to the TMOD administration process in regard to eligibility issues. Click HERE to read all about the ISE.

- … that the 2012 ACMO brochure has been completed and is available for distribution? If your facility needs any of these pamphlets, please contact NBEO at nbeo@optometry.org and they will be sent to you. Registration for the June 2012 ACMO is now open. Further information about the ACMO exam is available on the NBEO website (click HERE).

- … that due to several requests from our West Coast candidates, the NCCTO will begin offering late afternoon Part III CSE sessions on Mondays in August 2012?

- … that NBEO examination scores can be withheld from candidates who share written or clinical skills exam materials with others following a testing event? NBEO exam material is copyrighted and may not legally be reproduced verbally or in writing and subsequently disseminated to, or in any manner shared with, other students, optometry school/college faculty, study guide representatives, or anyone else.

- … that watches no longer may be brought into exam rooms on test days? Large wall clocks will be provided in each exam room so that candidates are able to match their test-taking progress with the time available to them. All candidates are requested to read and follow the exam day policies described on the NBEO website. Click HERE to view the Electronic Materials information under the Part I / ABS tab.
### Additional Information

#### NBEO Board of Directors

<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis D. Long</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry J. Davis</td>
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<td>St. Charles, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill R. Martinson-Redekopp</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Minot, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Rafferty</td>
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#### NBEO Executive Director

- **Jack E. Terry, O.D., Ph.D.**
  Charlotte, North Carolina

#### Next NBEO Exam

- **Part I Applied Basic Science (ABS)**
  - Date: March 20-21, 2012

- **Ongoing NCCTO Part III Clinical Skills Examination (CSE)**
  - Regular testing, through April 30, 2012
  - Special testing, through July 31, 2012

### 2012 National Board Exam Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 Exam</th>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>Registration Deadline</th>
<th>Extended Registration, Exam Withdrawal, and Site Change Deadline</th>
<th>ADA Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I ABS</td>
<td>March 20 - 21</td>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II PAM &amp; TMOD</td>
<td>April 3</td>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACMO</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I ABS</td>
<td>August 7 - 8</td>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>May 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II PAM &amp; TMOD</td>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>September 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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