# PROGRAM EVALUATION STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>EVALUATION PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board exam scores</td>
<td>· yields trend data over time&lt;br&gt;· can confirm faculty impressions</td>
<td>· time lag between program and exam&lt;br&gt;· data may need to be disaggregated&lt;br&gt;· may not reflect curriculum goals</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written exams – multiple choice</td>
<td>· objective&lt;br&gt;· machine gradable&lt;br&gt;· easily archived and revised&lt;br&gt;· scores easily aggregated</td>
<td>· cannot assess skills or behaviors&lt;br&gt;· labor intensive&lt;br&gt;· difficult to develop items that measure higher order learning/thinking</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written exams – essay</td>
<td>· relatively easy to design&lt;br&gt;· can be more objective than clinical observation&lt;br&gt;· potential for assessing reasoning better than multiple choice tests</td>
<td>· difficult/time intensive to grade&lt;br&gt;· more subjective than multiple choice tests&lt;br&gt;· cannot assess skills/behaviors&lt;br&gt;· scores not easily aggregated</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/document review</td>
<td>· data usually readily available&lt;br&gt;· “natural” source of data&lt;br&gt;· low-cost technique&lt;br&gt;· objective data</td>
<td>· provides unrepresentative sample&lt;br&gt;· can be heavily inferential&lt;br&gt;· may be difficult to aggregate data</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart reviews</td>
<td>· “natural” source of data&lt;br&gt;· provides data on application of knowledge&lt;br&gt;· low-cost&lt;br&gt;· readily available</td>
<td>· labor intensive&lt;br&gt;· difficult to aggregate data</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys/questionnaires of former participants</td>
<td>· self-administered&lt;br&gt;· anonymity may led to more honest responses&lt;br&gt;· relatively economical to administer&lt;br&gt;· large number of respondents may be surveyed</td>
<td>· questions may be misinterpreted&lt;br&gt;· may have low percentage return&lt;br&gt;· time lag may impact accuracy of data</td>
<td>Process&lt;br&gt;Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation forms completed by students</td>
<td>· inexpensive&lt;br&gt;· yields trend data over time</td>
<td>· students not trained in evaluation techniques&lt;br&gt;· sample may be small</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student projects</td>
<td>· application of learner knowledge/skills&lt;br&gt;· low-cost technique&lt;br&gt;· objective data</td>
<td>· provide unrepresentative sample&lt;br&gt;· can be heavily inferential&lt;br&gt;· may be difficult to aggregate data</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>EVALUATION PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Observation of learners | · can record events and behaviors as they happen  
· enhance ability to understand complex situations  
· allows trained observer to gather data from learner’s perspective | · most faculty not trained in observation techniques  
· observer’s presence may cause artificial situation  
· depends heavily on personal interpretation  
· less useful in large complex settings  
· usually confined to single setting, restricting comparison and contrast | Outcomes |
| Debriefings (group interviews) | · more cost-effective than individual interviews  
· focus on specific questions or needs  
· discussion clarifies learner’s intent  
· richer information than ratings | · learners may be intimidated  
· time/labor intensive  
· interviewer can influence outcomes  
· generalizability limited to small sample size  
· difficult to standardize data collection | Process  
Outcomes |
| Interviews | · can provide richer data  
· focus on specific questions or needs  
· discussion clarifies learner’s intent | · learners may be intimidated  
· time/labor intensive  
· cost inefficient  
· interviewer can influence outcomes  
· generalizability limited by small sample size  
· difficult to standardize data collection | Process  
Outcomes |
| Peer observation of teaching | · can record events and behaviors as they happen  
· enhance ability to understand complex situations  
· allows trained observer to gather data from learner’s perspective | · most faculty not trained in observation techniques  
· observer’s presence may cause artificial situation  
· depends heavily on personal interpretation  
· less useful in large complex settings  
· usually confined to single setting, restricting comparison and contrast | Process |
| Patient satisfaction inventories | · can aggregate data  
· "natural" source of data  
· can yield trend data over time | · biased by interpersonal relationship  
· patients may resist  
· patients may bias response | Outcomes |
| OSCE (Objective Structured Clinical Examination) | · controlled assessment of clinical performance  
· broader sampling of knowledge and skills than single standardized patient  
· standardized assessments  
· can assess behaviors and interpersonal skills  
· can assess application of knowledge | · time consuming  
· costly to develop and implement  
· logistically complex  
· requires rigorous training of standardized patients | Outcomes |