

# Future FELLOWS



December 2005, Volume 11, No. 4

Exams 3, 5-9, and Transitional VEE Exams

## Reading Period To Be Added to 2006 Exam Process

By Benjamin Clark, FCAS, Candidate Liaison Committee

The CAS understands the actuarial candidate's concern about being able to complete exams on time. Every exam committee has always had to balance the goal of testing each candidate's knowledge of the exam material with the ability to fit that testing within the time allotted for the exam.

As each actuary must have a strong grasp of various insurance topics and actuarial applications, the exam material will naturally be lengthy and very encompassing. In the past, the CAS has worked to manage the volume of topics tested on exams. Now, in addition to other efforts to manage exam length, the CAS has decided to attack another area of this balancing act: the time allotted for the exam itself.

Rather than increase the exam time, the CAS has decided to add a reading period immediately prior to the start of each exam. This is actually a common practice that other testing organizations use (such as the SOA essay exams). There are several activities the candidates may use this time to do:

- Ensure they do not have a defective exam.
- Formulate a strategy on how they wish to answer the exam.

→ turn to page 5

## New Appeals Policy Implemented for Exams 3, 5-9, and Transitional VEE Exams

Beginning in 2006, the appeals policy for multiple-choice questions for Exams 3, 5-9, and transitional VEE exams will change. The following is the new policy.

### Multiple-Choice Questions

If a candidate believes that a multiple-choice question is ambiguous or defective, he or she should bring this to the attention of the Examination Committee in writing within two weeks after the examination date. In order to aid the candidate, preliminary answer keys for multiple-choice questions will be available the week following the examinations. The candidate may submit comments to the CAS Office by mail, fax, or e-mail. The correspondence should include detailed reasons why the question is believed to be ambiguous or defective. (In addition to candidate comments, statistics are calculated on each problem to see how well the candidates answered the question. The statistics can indicate that a question may be faulty and the question will be

→ turn to page 6

## The CAS Office Has Moved!

Effective December 5, 2005 the CAS Office will have relocated to its new address at 4350 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 250, Arlington, VA 22203. The phone and fax numbers remain the same: (703) 276-3100 phone; (703) 276-3108 fax. The post office/lock box address, which is used for mailing checks to CAS, also remains the same: CAS, PO Box 425, Merrifield, VA 22116-0425.



Dates to Remember

### Winter CBT Exam 1/P Deadlines

Exam Registration:  
December 15, 2005  
Refund Deadline: Noon of  
the third business day  
before test appointment

### Winter VEE Exam Deadlines

Exam Registration:  
January 5, 2006  
Change of Test Center:  
January 5, 2006  
Refund Deadline:  
March 9, 2006

### Spring 2006 Exam Registration Deadlines

Exams 3, 5, 7, and 8:  
March 16, 2006  
Joint Exams 2 and 4:  
April 1, 2006  
Refund Deadline:  
Three weeks after  
exam date  
*There is only one deadline  
for each set of exams. Late  
registrations will not be  
accepted.*

### CAS Seminars and Meetings

Seminar on  
Ratemaking  
March 13-14, 2006  
Marriott Salt Lake  
City Downtown  
Salt Lake City, Utah

ERM Symposium  
April 23-26, 2006  
Sheraton Downtown  
Chicago, Illinois

# Questions from an Exam Strategy Session

By Anju Arora, FCAS, Candidate Liaison Committee

The following questions were submitted to the Candidate Liaison Committee from the Student Development Committee at Nationwide Insurance Company in Columbus, Ohio.

## Grading

### 1. How does the grading process work? How many people grade the same exam? Is it done by question?

Short answer—For essay questions, typically there are two graders for each question. Each grader reads the candidate response and assigns a point value. The graders independently review a representative sample of candidate responses and then discuss whether any modifications to the grading key are appropriate. After all responses are independently scored, the two graders exchange their scores and thoughts about specific issues that emerged, and reconcile their scores within a certain range before the group grading process. Want more information? Under “General Exam Information” in the “Admissions” section of the CAS Web Site there is a series on “Looking at the CAS Examination Process” by Arlene Woodruff. In Part II, you’ll walk through the grading process. While you’re there, read Part I (Creating the Examination), which gives a good sense of the process behind the exams.

### 2. What are you looking for in the short answers? Key words or whether we are reading all the content? Is it better to write an essay or just make a list?

The graders read the entire answer. It’s not necessary to use complete sentences if a list or bullet points will do. A valuable source in obtaining a sense of just how much or how little detail is needed for full credit is to review sample answers from previous exams on the CAS Web Site. The answers are generally actual candidate responses that earned full credit. During the exam, take a deep breath and when you reread your answer, make sure it’s complete enough to maximize getting full point value. But do remember if the question asks for three items, only the first three items listed will be graded so don’t waste time writing more.

### 3. In a computation problem, how much work should be shown? Should everything be labeled? Do you need to do the actual work or can you just set up the problem and demonstrate the needed steps? If you don’t have time to compute, will writing down the applicable formulas help?

The exam instructions say show all work to receive full credit or to maximize partial credit. Basically, you need to show enough work to demonstrate that you know what you are doing. If you show your set-up to the problem, and make an error

transferring a number from the question, the graders can see what you did and only a small amount will be taken off. However, if you don’t show your work, the committee can’t tell the difference between a minor error such as this and a fundamental lack of understanding of the concepts being tested. Again, sample answers to previous exams are a good guide here.

### 4. If a question does not say “According to,” will reasonable answers not specifically mentioned in the paper be accepted?

Yes. The intent in publishing the learning objectives was to allow for broader answers that will be equally accepted.

### 5. If a question is unclear or certain pieces of information are not available, will credit still be given if assumptions are written out and the solution follows the assumptions?

Yes—if the solution is appropriate to the assumptions presented by the candidate. One of the benefits of essay questions is the opportunity for the candidate to state assumptions that will help in getting full point value or maximizing partial credit.

### 6. If a question is appealed and later determined incorrect/invalid how is that handled? Will they regrade that question on all the submitted exams and possibly adjust the exam score or pass rate?

If an appeal is accepted whether it is due to incorrect/invalid question or if an alternate solution is deemed acceptable, every candidate’s response to that question will be regraded and the candidate’s score will be adjusted accordingly. In fact, four candidates passed Exam 7-U.S. this past spring as a result of appeals

submitted by other candidates.

## General

### 1. Is there a preference for writing the exam in ink or pencil?

Graders are given photocopies of the solutions. Ink photocopies are better but reproduction is done at a better level so really it is personal preference. If a photocopy is deemed difficult to read, the grader has the original checked at the CAS Office. Significant effort is made to give every answer a chance to be graded.

### 2. If you erase a lot or make a lot of errors, should you just start over with a fresh sheet of paper?

It’s not necessary to start over, especially since time management is essential during the exam. Clearly cross out what isn’t part of the solution and make very clear what the solution is. Graders will make the effort to work through the solution. I can remember one solution when I was taking exams in which I penciled out half of the page. I couldn’t afford the time to rewrite the other half. Clarity is the key here—if a candidate lightly

**During the exam, take a deep breath and when you reread your answer, make sure it’s complete enough to maximize getting full point value.**

# Emerging Issues

## Silica—The Next Asbestos?

By Gareth L. Kennedy, Candidate Representative to the Candidate Liaison Committee

*Editor's Note: A recent readers' survey indicated that CAS candidates would like to see articles on current events in Future Fellows. This is the first of a series of articles that will occasionally appear.*

With pending legislation in Congress and the increasing number of bankruptcies of asbestos defendants, plaintiff's attorneys have started to look elsewhere for the next asbestos. Some of these attorneys have focused their attention on silica and its tracer disease silicosis.

Silica can be found in soil, sand, rock, and many minerals. Its most common form is quartz, the second most abundant mineral on earth. Quartz, also known as crystalline silica, when used to cut, blast, grind, or many other tasks produces respirable quartz particles. It is through overexposure to this quartz dust that the disabling and sometimes fatal lung disease of silicosis can be developed.

The workers with the greatest potential exposure to respirable silica are those who work in industries such as construction, mining, stone cutting, glass manufacture, shipbuilding, railroad, and various areas of manufacturing. The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) estimates that 1.7 million U.S. workers are exposed to crystalline silica each year, of which 100,000 are at a

high risk of developing silicosis. According to the DOL, depending upon the amount of exposure, a person can get three different levels of silicosis. The three levels and the required exposure levels are:

1. Chronic silicosis—10 or more years of low concentration exposure;
2. Accelerated silicosis—five to 10 years of high exposure;
3. Acute silicosis—extremely high concentrations exposure over a short period of time (a few weeks up to five years).

The most common form is chronic silicosis, which may take up to 15 to 20 years for it to be detected by a routine X-ray.

While both silica dust and asbestos dust can cause lung diseases, silicosis differs from asbestos related diseases in two main ways. The first way is that people are not affected by silicosis simply by a one-time exposure. A small one-time asbestos exposure can result in an asbestos-related disease. On the other hand, silicosis requires a considerable amount of exposure to silica dust. Secondly, exposure to silicosis results in fewer deaths than asbestos-related diseases. Various reports indicate silicosis

The Department of Labor (DOL) estimates that 1.7 million U.S. workers are exposed to crystalline silica each year, of which 100,000 are at a high risk of developing silicosis. According to the DOL, depending upon the amount of exposure, a person can get three different levels of silicosis.

crosses out the wrong section, it might not be apparent, especially on photocopies. The candidate should make sure it is clear what they intend to be graded.

### 3. Cursive or print?

The candidate should use whichever one is the most legible. It depends on the candidate.

### 4. When grading, what happens if the answer is not legible? What if it did not copy clearly, but is legible on the original sheet?

As stated before, every answer is given a fair chance to be graded, including checking the original when the photocopy is difficult to read. Ultimately, though, it is the candidate's responsibility to write legibly and to make their answers clear.

## Writing

### 1. What kinds of guidelines are given to those who draft exam questions?

The Examination Committee hires outside education experts in psychometrics (science of testing) to train exam writers. New writers are required to take a full-day workshop and supply questions for critique during the workshop. This requirement has been in place for three years.

### 2. Is the exam as a whole looked over and evaluated before it is distributed?

The entire process is too long to publish here so I've included an excerpt from Arlene Woodruff's online article titled "Creating the Examination:"

"In the beginning of the year the first draft of the exam is sent to the [general officer]-exam series and exam consultant, and, in some cases, an academic consultant. All the exams for the Spring series are reviewed by the Spring [general officer]...for technical content, clarity, balance, length, and difficulty. The exam consultant is usually an actuary with expertise in the material covered by the exam. The consultant...looks for technical content while keeping an eye out for questions which conflict with real-life situations. An academic consultant is not necessarily an actuary but rather an independent expert in the field. Teleconferences between the [general officer], part chair and consultant can take several hours as each question is discussed in detail. During this review, any questions that are faulty or ambiguous will be fixed or thrown out, and one of the supplemental questions will be used instead. The part chair will then prepare a second draft for the next level of review."

To read the entire article online, see the first question in this article under "Grading."

### 3. How is the mix of questions determined?

The part chair in consultation with members of the part committee, the general officer, and the chairperson of the Examination Committee, determined the mix of exam questions to be consistent with the learning objectives set by the Syllabus Committee. I know that's a lot of parts and chairs but the important

**U.S. Department of Labor estimates that 1.7 million workers are exposed to crystalline silica, which 100,000 workers are at high risk of silicosis. According to the CDC, depending upon the level of exposure, a worker can get three levels of silicosis.**

deaths to be in the vicinity of 200-300 per year and in decline. In comparison, the number of asbestos-related deaths per year is approximately 1,500 and increasing.

The effect of silica exposure is not a new problem. Silicosis is often referred to as the oldest known occupational lung disease. The U.S. insurance industry has paid silica claims since the 1930s. Initially these claims were made under general liability insurance coverage. But after several plaintiff victories resulting in large payments, the insurance industry successfully pursued a change in the law that brought industrial occupational diseases into the workers compensation system.

In recent years there has been a large increase in filed silica-related claims. Most claims currently being filed are for exposure in the period from the mid-1970s through to the mid-1980s. Yet, claims go back to exposure starting in the 1950s. For

one large insurance company there has been a tenfold rise in claims in two years. That company is reported to be handling 25,000 claims in 28 states.

This surge in claims is from insureds seeking coverage from the product liability portion of their general liability policies. These claims are based on either allegations of failure to warn or on allegations of defective products. The former are typically from bulk distributors of silica products, while the latter are from protective equipment manufacturers.

Product liability coverage has typically been offered with

aggregate limits, unlike premises and operations coverage that usually has no aggregate limits. If litigants do attempt to reclassify claims to fall under premises and operations coverage, this could lead to significantly more exposure for insurance companies as the case has been with asbestos-related claims.

Companies and insurers have tried to defend the onslaught of claims with mixed success. One such example is the use of the sophisticated-user defense. This defense argues that the company sold its products only to sophisticated users who knew or should have known the hazards of the product and therefore the company did not need to warn the user. This approach has been successful in a state court in Ohio. But in another case this defense was overturned in the Texas Court of Appeals.

To date the biggest step to stem the tide of claims has come from a federal judge in Texas. Judge Janis Graham Jack, a former nurse, could not understand why her court was being asked to consider 10,000 claims regarding a disease that only kills approximately 200 people a year. She held pretrial hearings over a 20-month-period and discovered some startling facts regarding the diagnosis of the cases before her.

Judge Jack found that over 99 percent of the diagnoses came from six doctors who had been retained by law firms and "screening companies." One doctor took 72 hours to perform 1,239 diagnostic evaluations, less than four minutes a case. Another doctor signed blank forms for his secretary to fill out the diagnosis. Yet another doctor admitted he didn't know the criteria for diagnosis after diagnosing 3,617 patients with silicosis. Judge Jack issued a stinging decision that threw out nearly all of the 10,000 cases and stated, "These diagnoses were manufactured for money."

Is silicosis the next asbestos for insurance companies? With recent court decisions, a lower exposure base, and claims that are mainly only product liability based, the issue of silica looks

point is that there are knowledgeable individuals involved to create a fair and balanced exam. What this group is looking for is a mix of questions that lines up as much as possible with the learning objectives, while providing an appropriate balance of difficulty and length. The goal is to create an exam that allows the Examination Committee to distinguish between those who have demonstrated an adequate level of knowledge and those who have not.

#### **4. Do the same people who write the question also grade the question?**

Two graders score each question and then discuss any emerging grading issues. Typically, one of the graders was involved in drafting the question, and one was not.

## **Pass Score**

### **1. How is the pass score determined?**

The answer is lengthy but worth the printing space given the importance of the question. In the Syllabus under "Determination of Pass Mark" in the section on "Grades and Accreditation," the first paragraph reads ...

"According to CAS policy, the overriding goal in setting the examination pass marks is to pass all candidates who, in the opinion of the CAS, have demonstrated by their exam responses a sufficient grasp of the syllabus material and to fail those candidates who have not. No predetermined pass ratio will be used for setting the pass mark. As part of the input to the pass mark

determination process, a panel of experts in the subject material is convened to review the examination.

Each expert is asked to review each question in the examination, and assess the difficulty of that question. More specifically, the panelist is asked to estimate the amount of credit that a candidate with minimum adequate knowledge competency would receive for the question. This information, averaged across the panel of experts, gives a preliminary estimate of the pass mark. Because the level of difficulty for each examination may vary from year to year, each part committee collects extensive data to ascertain the level of difficulty of its examination. The part committee compares the per-





unlikely to reach the dizzying heights of asbestos exposure to the insurance industry. Yet many believe it is still too early to tell. Future adverse court decisions, an increased use of premises and operations coverage, scientific links to other lung diseases, and more awareness in medical and legal circles, could all come together and cause another asbestos-type problem for the insurance industry.

#### References

1. Chesler, Robert D., James Stewart, and Geoffrey T. Gibson, "Is Silica the Next Asbestos?" *New Jersey Law Journal*, Volume CLXXVI, No. 13, Index 1236.

2. Hartwig, Robert P., and Claire Wilkinson, "Silica Liability." Insurance Information Institute, July 2004, [www.iii.org](http://www.iii.org).
3. Hechler, David, "Silica plaintiffs suffer setbacks," *The National Law Journal*, February 28, 2005:1.
4. "The Silicosis Sheriff," Editorial, *Wall Street Journal*, July 14, 2005. [ff](#)

## Reading Period

from cover page

- Read the more lengthy or difficult questions to understand what is being asked.
- Take a deep breath and relax.

This change will be implemented at the beginning of 2006 and will occur on Exams 3, 5-9, and all VEE exams. There will be a 15-minute reading period for the CAS exams and a minimum 10-minute reading period for the VEE exams. Please note: **this time is allotted for only reading the exam.** Writing will NOT be permitted and all candidates must keep their pens or pencils down.

The reading period will begin at the published start time of the exam. Therefore, it is still suggested that all candidates arrive at least 45 minutes prior to the start of the exam. Any candidate arriving after the published start time will miss out on the reading period (as well as possibly missing the start of the writing period) and might also disrupt other candidates.

The proctor will continue to give instructions prior to the published start time. Once candidates have read the exam instructions, the proctor will give the candidates the reading period to read the questions silently. Once the reading period is over, the proctor will give the instruction to begin the exam. This will mark the beginning of the timed section of the exam.

The reading period will NOT shorten the time period for candidates to take the exam. Thus, the timed section of the exam will actually conclude later than the current published completion time. This reading period will not affect how the exam committees determine how much material will be tested on the exam. Each exam committee will still follow the same process in determining how much material is reasonable to test on a given exam. [ff](#)



formance of the present year's candidates to the performance of candidates from prior years. Appropriate recognition is given to any peculiarities that may appear in connection with the answers to any question on an

examination despite all the care taken in setting the examination questions.

"After this, the pass mark is set consistent with the above goal. The examination part chairperson presents the recommended pass mark with the supporting data to the general officer who oversees that examination part, the Examination Committee chairperson, and the vice president-admissions. The final decision on the pass mark is the responsibility of the vice

president-admissions."

#### 2. How much is tied to the difficulty of the exam and how much is tied to letting a certain percent pass?

I trust the previous answer responds to this question as well. For even more details, refer to the *Syllabus*.

## Future Exam Changes

#### 1. Is the CAS moving to eight exams?

The Task Force on FCAS Education is Board-appointed to make recommendations for changes to the upper-level education structure. A final report is scheduled to be delivered to the Board of Directors in November 2005. Once any decision is made, a notice will be posted on the CAS Web Site.

#### 2. Is the CAS getting rid of the Associate designation?

The Board is still considering this proposal. The decision will likely be considered within the context of changes to the overall exam structure.

#### 3. Anything else? Grading, pass rate, etc.

As issues are raised, considered, and acted upon, the CAS makes every effort to keep all current members and candidates updated. My suggestion would be to routinely visit the "Admissions" section of the CAS Web Site, read *Future Fellows* and the "Notice of Examinations" carefully and contact the Candidate Liaison Committee with your concerns. [ff](#)

# Exam Vendor Links

## Actex Publications/Mad River Books

[www.actexamdriver.com](http://www.actexamdriver.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8

## Actuarial Bookstore

[www.actuarialbookstore.com](http://www.actuarialbookstore.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8

## Actuarial Study Manuals

[www.studymanuals.com](http://www.studymanuals.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4

## All 10, LLC

[www.all10.com](http://www.all10.com)  
Exams 5, 7, 8

## Austin Actuarial Seminars

[www.actuarialseminars.com](http://www.actuarialseminars.com)  
Exam 4

## BPP Professional Education

[www.bpp.com](http://www.bpp.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4

## Prof. Sam Broverman

[www.sambroverman.com](http://www.sambroverman.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4

## Casualty Actuaries of the Mid-Atlantic Region

[sbm.temple.edu/actsci-seminar](http://sbm.temple.edu/actsci-seminar)  
Exams 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8

## Casualty Study Manuals

[www.csmanuals.com/csframe.htm](http://www.csmanuals.com/csframe.htm)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, VEE Exams

## Goldfarb Seminars

[www.GoldfarbSeminars.com](http://www.GoldfarbSeminars.com)  
Exam 8

## Illinois State University Actuarial Program

[www.math.ilstu.edu/actuary/prepcourses.html](http://www.math.ilstu.edu/actuary/prepcourses.html)  
Exams 1, 2

## New England Actuarial Seminars

[www.neas-seminars.com/misc](http://www.neas-seminars.com/misc)  
Exam 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8

## Midwest Actuarial Forum

[www.casact.org/affiliates/maf](http://www.casact.org/affiliates/maf)  
Exams 3, 4

## SlideRule Books

[www.sliderulebooks.com](http://www.sliderulebooks.com)  
Exams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8



## New Appeals Policy

from cover page

reviewed even without a candidate writing.) The CAS Examination Committee will investigate all questions brought to its attention in writing. To be considered in the grading process, correspondence must reach the CAS Office by the following deadlines:

- ♦ For Winter VEE Exams March 2, 2006
- ♦ For Spring Exams May 12, 2006
- ♦ For Summer VEE Exams August 23, 2006
- ♦ For Fall Exams November 16, 2006


No appeals based on ambiguous or defective questions will be considered after these deadlines. After grades are released, the only appeal permitted on multiple-choice questions will be to request an administrative check of the candidate's short-answer card to verify that the card reader scanned the card correctly and that the output file reflected this data. This request must be made within three weeks after the release of grades.

## Essay Questions

Once candidates have received an analysis of their exam, they may appeal their grade. Only candidates with valid appeals will be considered. Sample answers to essay questions will be available on July 31, for Spring Examinations, and January 31, for Fall Examinations. The sample essay answers are actual responses that have received credit and are illustrative of successful answers, although they may not be considered perfect answers.

If the candidate believes that the sample essay answer is incorrect or there is an alternative correct solution, the candidate must

provide specific information on why his or her solution is correct. With specific information, the Examination Committee can research the answer properly and reply to the candidate. An example of an invalid appeal would be the following: "I am appealing my score of 5 on Exam 9, please recheck my examination." Another example of an invalid appeal would be: "On question number 2, I believe I should get full credit because I answered the following . . ."

Appeals must reach the CAS Office not later than August 31, for Spring Examinations and February 28, for Fall Examinations. When a valid appeal is received, it is reviewed by the part chairperson and a recommendation is made to the Examination Committee chairperson. The Examination Committee chairperson will respond based on the recommendation of the part chairperson. 

## Update on Code of Professional Conduct

Due to issues that have been raised about implementing a requirement that CAS candidates agree to be bound by the Code of Professional Conduct, the CAS has decided to postpone implementation of this requirement.

# The Purpose of Learning Objectives

By Dana R. Frantz, FCAS, Candidate Liaison Committee

It has been over two years since the CAS Syllabus Committee implemented the use of published learning objectives, which was recommended the Chauncey Group (now part of Thomson Prometric). It seems like good timing to reiterate the purpose of those learning objectives and to include the Syllabus and Examination Committees' perspectives on them. Now that candidates have been using them for five exam sittings, the Candidate Liaison Committee (CLC) would like to solicit feedback from candidates to determine how the learning objectives are really being used in candidates' study efforts. We would also like to determine to what extent they are serving the purpose that the Examination and Syllabus Committees intended.

The purpose of a well-written learning objective is to identify what successful candidates will be able to **do** following completion of the learning experience and not just what knowledge they should gain. Knowledge statements and the relevant syllabus readings then follow each learning objective. The learning objectives are also meant to focus a candidate's study efforts so that they can approach a paper knowing what knowledge they should gain and what they should be able to demonstrate rather than memorizing every detail.


Having learning objectives also focuses the content of syllabus readings. The objectives are identified first, and the relevant readings are then matched against those objectives. This can reveal areas where the current syllabus readings do not provide adequate learning material and should be supplemented or replaced. The Syllabus Committee reviews these learning objectives annually and updates them as appropriate. For a list of the learning objectives for each exam, see the introduction "Materials for Study" in the *Syllabus* ([www.casact.org/admissions/syllabus/2006/materials.htm](http://www.casact.org/admissions/syllabus/2006/materials.htm)).

The Examination Committee also uses the learning objectives to guide CAS question writers. The members of the Examination Committee stress the need to link the writing of questions to the intended learning objectives for each exam and to ensure that the specific exam provides ad-

equately overall coverage of the learning objectives. Good questions should follow the same orientation as good learning objectives—testing whether candidates are capable of completing the relevant actions, not just a rote regurgitation of what the candidate has memorized.

The learning objectives have also facilitated new question-writing assignments for those who draft exam questions. Question writers were previously assigned to write a certain number of questions from particular readings without any guidance on where to focus. Question writers are now assigned particular learning objectives on which to write questions. This encourages possible integration of multiple readings that support one learning objective. It also tends to eliminate questions of the form "According to..." or "Based on..." Again, all of this stresses movement away from memorizing readings and movement towards what candidates are able to **do**.

As mentioned above, the Candidate Liaison Committee would like to communicate to the Syllabus Committee whether the learning objectives are serving their intended purposes for the candidates. To what extent the learning objects are or are not being used for their intended purpose is valuable information to the Syllabus Committee in its work to improve the CAS education process. The learning objectives may not have necessarily steered candidates away from feeling like they still have to memorize minutiae. The link between the learning objectives and exam questions may not yet be clear to all candidates. As actuaries, we are trained to use the past to assess future probabilities. The number one resource for studying is still past exam problems, many of which were written before the creation of explicit learning objectives.

The learning objectives are meant to identify what successful candidates will be able to **do** following completion of the learning experience. The CLC would like to (most importantly) know if candidates believe that the learning objectives are serving this purpose. Please send your feedback to the Candidate Liaison Committee by using the Learning Objectives Survey in the "Admissions" section of the CAS Web Site. (The survey will be available until February 17, 2006.) 

## Candidate Liaison Committee Mission

The Candidate Liaison Committee communicates with CAS candidates, collectively and individually, who are taking CAS examinations. The committee informs candidates as to appropriate courses of action available to them. Through periodic communication, this committee informs candidates of results of examination administrations, actions taken on complaints received regarding examination questions, and reasons for syllabus and examination changes being implemented. Communication encompasses existing policies and procedures as well as changes being considered. The committee should advise the CAS and its committees of the interests of the candidates regarding matters that come before the CAS and its committees. Candidates may contact the Candidate Liaison Committee at the CAS Office address.



*Future Fellows* is published four times per year by the Casualty Actuarial Society, 4350 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 250, Arlington, Virginia 22203.  
Telephone: (703) 276-3100;  
Fax: (703) 276-3108;  
E-mail: [office@casact.org](mailto:office@casact.org);  
CAS Web Site: [www.casact.org](http://www.casact.org).

Presorted Standard postage is paid at Sterling, Virginia.

**Candidate Liaison Committee:**

**Janet S. Katz**, FCAS, Chairperson  
**Anju Arora**, FCAS

**Benjamin W. Clark**, FCAS  
**Dana R. Frantz**, FCAS  
**George M. Levine**, FCAS  
**Christopher C. McKenna**, FCAS  
**Timothy K. Pollis**, ACAS  
**Erica W. Szeto**, FCAS  
**Theresa Ann Turnacioglu**, FCAS  
**Brian K. Turner**, FCAS  
**Kendall P. Williams**, FCAS

**Candidate Representatives:**

**Christina D. Abbott**  
**Gareth L. Kennedy**

**Examination Committee Liaison to the Candidate Liaison Committee:**

**Virginia R. Prevosto**, FCAS

**CAS Director of Admissions:**

**J. Thomas Downey**

**CAS Examinations Coordinator:**

**Robert L. Craver**

**CAS Admissions Coordinator:**

**Laura C. Mayer**

**CAS Manager of Publications:**

**Elizabeth A. Smith**

**CAS Desktop Publisher:**

**Daniel J. Magnolia**

**Subscriptions** to the newsletter are complimentary to CAS candidates who registered for a CAS Examination during the previous two years.

**For information**, please contact the CAS Office. Send all letters to the editor to the CAS Office address.

**Postmaster:** Please send all address changes to: The Casualty Actuarial Society, 4350 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 250, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

**For permission to reprint material**, please write to the chairperson of the CAS Candidate Liaison Committee at the CAS Office address. The CAS is not responsible for statements or opinions expressed in the articles, discussions, or letters printed in this newsletter.

©2005 Casualty Actuarial Society  
ISSN 1094-169-X

# Exam Updates & Web Resources

- Register online for Exams 3, 5-9, and Transitional VEE Exams in the “Admissions” section of the CAS Web Site.
  - Please check the “Admissions” section for:
    - ◆ Updates to the *Syllabus of Basic Education*
    - ◆ “Notice of Examinations”
    - ◆ “Verify Candidate Exam Status” to verify that joint exams and VEE credits are properly recorded
    - ◆ Grades are released between 3:00 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. Eastern Time approximately eight weeks after the exam administration.
  - If you have not received a confirmation of your registration for Exams 3, 5-9, and VEE exams **two weeks** before the registration deadline, please contact the CAS Office to verify that your registration has arrived before the deadline.
  - Remember your Candidate Number! Candidate Numbers will not be given over the telephone.
  - Visit the “Regional Affiliates” section to find out about the activities of your local Regional Affiliate.
- 

PRSR STD  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Dulles, Va  
PERMIT NO. 056



**FELLOWS**  
*Future*

Casualty Actuarial Society  
4350 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 250, Arlington, Virginia 22203  
Please note that the Post Office address for registrations will remain the same.