



Investigation of Clinical Medical Teachers' Opinion about Validity-Feasibility of Clinical Assessment Tools in Medical Sciences Universities in Tehran

PDF (Size: 77KB) PP. 946-950 DOI: 10.4236/ce.2012.326144

Author(s)

Jalil Kuhpayeh Zadeh, Helen Dargahi, Jila Shajari, Rafei Ali, Mahsa Narenjiha, Soudabeh Afsharpour, Darioush Mehdivarzi

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is investigation about validity and feasibility of clinical assessment methods in the point of view of clinical instructors. The descriptive study was done in Tehran city universities. Population study consisted of academic clinical experts. The instrument was a two-part questionnaire made by using Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) suggested questionnaire and valid scientific resources. Sampling was based-objected. Total of obtained questionnaires were 83 which were collected from universities Tehran University of Medical Sciences (39), Iran University of Medical Sciences (24) and Shahid Beheshti Medical University (20). Data analysis was conducted by SPSS16. Data indicated that the majority of the study population believed that MCQ (97.6%) is used in clinical setting. OSCE (92.8%) and Logbook (86.7%) are the next methods. Furthermore, Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) (8.4%) and Portfolio (6%) are not often used; whereas the most suitable and feasible medical students' clinical assessment tools in variety of domains are completely different so that there are lots of suggested methods for efficient evaluation. Also, the most suitable and feasible methods were the same in 60% cases. Clearly, no single rating is able to provide the whole story about any doctor's ability to practice medicine, as this requires the demonstration of ongoing competence across a number of different general and specific areas.

KEYWORDS

Validity, Feasibility; Clinical Assessment Methods; Medical Sciences University; Tehran; Clinical Medical Teachers

Cite this paper

Zadeh, J. , Dargahi, H. , Shajari, J. , Ali, R. , Narenjiha, M. , Afsharpour, S. & Mehdivarzi, D. (2012). Investigation of Clinical Medical Teachers' Opinion about Validity-Feasibility of Clinical Assessment Tools in Medical Sciences Universities in Tehran. *Creative Education*, 3, 946-950. doi: 10.4236/ce.2012.326144.

References

- [1] Baral, N., & Paudel, B. H. (2007). An evaluation of training of teachers in medical education in four medical schools of Nepal. *Nepal Medical College Journal*, 9, 157-161.
- [2] Bourbonnais, F., Langford, S., & Giannantonio, L. (2008). Development of a clinical evaluation tool for baccalaureate nursing students. *Nurse Educational Practice*, 8, 62-71. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2007.06.005
- [3] Brown, N., & Doshi, M. (2006). Assessing professional and clinical competence: The way forward. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 12, 81-91.
- [4] Cogbill, K. K., O' Sullivan, P. S., & Clardy, J. (2005). Residents' perception of effectiveness of twelve evaluation methods for measuring competency. *Academic Psychiatry*, 29, 76-81. doi: 10.1176/appi.ap.29.1.76
- [5] Colletti, L. M. (2000). Difficulty with Negative Feedback: Face-to-face evaluation of junior medical student clinical performance results in grade inflation. *The Journal of Surgical Research*, 90, 82-87.

- [Open Special Issues](#)
- [Published Special Issues](#)
- [Special Issues Guideline](#)

[CE Subscription](#)
[Most popular papers in CE](#)
[About CE News](#)
[Frequently Asked Questions](#)
[Recommend to Peers](#)
[Recommend to Library](#)
[Contact Us](#)

Downloads:	195,379
------------	---------

Visits:	428,362
---------	---------

Sponsors, Associates, and Links >>

- [The Conference on Information Technology in Education \(CITE 2012\)](#)

- [6] Collins, J. (2006). Writing multiple choice questions for continuing medical education activities and self-assessment modules. *Radiographcs*, 26, 543-551. doi:10.1148/rg.262055145
- [7] Dannefer, E., Henson, L., Bierer, S., et al. (2005). Peer assessment of professional competence. *Medical Education*, 39, 713-722. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x
- [8] Gigante, J., & Swan, R. A. (2010). Simplified observation tool for residents in the outpatient clinic. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 2, 108-110. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-09-00090.1
- [9] http://www.acgme.org/outcome/e-learn/redir_module3manual.asp
- [10] Jafarzadeh, A., (2009). Designing the OSCE method for evaluation of practical immunology course of medical students: In comparison to written-MCQ and oral examination. *Rawal Medical Journal*, 34, 219-222.
- [11] Johnson, N., & Chen, J. (2006). Medical student evaluation of teaching quality between obstetrics and gynecology residents and faculty as clinical preceptors in ambulatory gynecology. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 195, 1479-1483. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2006.05.038
- [12] Joyce, B. (2006). Developing an assessment system. *Facilitator' s Guide*. Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education,
- [13] Kogan, J., Bellina, L., & Shea, J. (2003). Feasibility, reliability, and validity of the Mini-CEX in a medicine core clerkship. *Academic Medicine*, 78, 533-535.
- [14] Mc Coubrie, P. (2004). Improving the fairness of multiple-choice questions: A literature review. *Medical Teaching*, 26, 709-712. doi:10.1080/01421590400013495
- [15] Michels, N. R., Driessen, E. W., Muijtjens, A. M., Van Gaal, L. F., Bossaert, L. L., & De Winter, B. Y. (2009). Portfolio assessment during medical internships: How to obtain a reliable and feasible assessment procedure? *Education Health*, 22, 313.
- [16] Norcini, J., & McKinle, D. (2007). Assessment methods in medical education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 239-250. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.12.021
- [17] Pearce, G., & Lee, G. (2007). Marketing student perceptions of viva voce (oral examination) as an Assessment Method. *ANZMAC 2007: Reputation, Responsibility, Relevance*. 8.
- [18] Ronald, M., & Epstein, M. D. (2007). Assessment in medical education. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 356, 387-396. doi:10.1056/NEJMra054784
- [19] Shumway, J. M., & Harden, R. M. (2003). AMEE education guide No. 25: The assessment of learning