




Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Tzu Chi Medical Journal

journal homepage: www.tzuchimedjnl.com

Original Article

Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) including critical simulation: Evaluation of medical student competence

Ming-Chen Hsieh^{a,b,c,*}, Wei-Chun Cheng^d, Tsung-Ying Chen^{a,b,d}^a Department of Medical Education, Buddhist Tzu Chi General Hospital, Hualien, Taiwan^b Department of Medicine, College of Medicine, Tzu Chi University, Hualien, Taiwan^c Department of Curriculum Design and Human Potentials Development, National Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan^d Department of Anesthesiology, Buddhist Tzu Chi General Hospital, Hualien, Taiwan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 May 2013

Received in revised form

10 June 2013

Accepted 15 July 2013

Keywords:

Assessment

Critical condition

Objective Structured Clinical Examination

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To develop an Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) station to assess the evaluation skills of medical students in applying evidence and appropriate treatment options in critical situations with a simulated patient. To assess the results using discrimination and reliability comparison of standardized and simulated patient stations.

Materials and Methods: OSCE performance scores of 58 7th-year medical students at the University of Tzu-Chi School of Medicine were analyzed from April 10, 2011 to April 11, 2011 using descriptive statistics and item discrimination. Thirteen OSCE cases were identified for evaluation; we compared the results of all the stations to those of the station with the critical clinical scenario.

Results: Discrimination statistics indicated that only the critical scenario station prepared with a high-fidelity simulator was effective in distinguishing between high-scoring and low-scoring medical students.

Conclusion: Failure to design a skill assessment tool is a missed opportunity to understand more fully and apply the results of the clinical performance of medical students.

Copyright © 2013, Buddhist Compassion Relief Tzu Chi Foundation. Published by Elsevier Taiwan LLC. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Competency-based education has been popular in medical education for the past decade and is currently the mainstream method of teaching clinical knowledge. It tries to incorporate new models to create medical education objectives [1]. Assessing student clinical skills is also a crucial element in their training. The Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) is a widely accepted tool to evaluate the clinical competence of medical students [2]. Studies have demonstrated that the OSCE is an effective tool for evaluating areas most critical to the performance of healthcare professionals, such as the ability to obtain information from a patient, establish rapport and communicate, and interpret data and solve problems [3]. Although assessment may be part of an institution or course evaluative process, or have other purposes, teachers use assessment for either summative or formative

processes [4]. The OSCE station content varies according to student experience and the nature of the assessment. The types of problems portrayed in an OSCE are those that students would commonly encounter in a clinic or hospital. Standardized patients (SPs) typically have general complaints, although some could present with problems related to emergency conditions [5,6]. Although students in training are familiar with basic practices in critical care medicine, an OSCE is seldom included when evaluating the condition of critically ill patients [7]. During the clinical rotation, medical students have direct patient care responsibilities through which they learn about various forms of critical illness, and how to apply different therapeutic and diagnostic modalities commonly used in critical care medicine [8]. Failure to address critical condition performance is a missed opportunity to understand better and use the results of such examinations for a competence-based evaluation for medical students [9]. Developing an OSCE station for complex critical conditions poses unique challenges. However, current technology allows for critical care scenarios, complete with cardiac and respiratory arrest on a computerized patient simulator in rapid transit stations, such as OSCE [10].

The study design was chosen to allow for collecting quantitative measures of medical student performance in managing a set of

Conflicts of interest: none.

* Corresponding author. Department of Medical Education, Buddhist Tzu Chi General Hospital, 707, Section 3, Chung-Yang Road, Hualien, Taiwan. Tel./fax: +886 3 8462722.

E-mail address: jeany.jeany@msa.hinet.net (M.-C. Hsieh).

simulated critical shock emergencies. We developed an OSCE station to assess the evaluation skills of medical students in applying evidence and appropriate treatment options in critical situations with a simulated patient. This investigation determined whether critical management OSCE stations play a meaningful role in a summative examination, and assesses the results using discrimination and reliability comparison of standardized and simulated patient stations.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study participants

The Department of Medical Education and School of Medicine at Tzu Chi University in Hualien, Taiwan has held routine OSCE examinations since 1996. This retrospective study collected and analyzed relevant OSCE information from 7th-year medical students at Buddhist Tzu Chi General Hospital in 2010. Fifty-eight participants had completed training courses in various subjects, including internal medicine, surgery, pediatrics, and critical care. This study was reviewed and performed by the Research Ethics Committee in accordance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval at Buddhist Tzu Chi General Hospital (IRB 101-06).

2.2. Study design

The development of the OSCE examination component was based on a collaborative effort led by faculty members who had experience with case design. The OSCE examined the range of clinical competence in clinical scenarios including interviewing, physical examination skills, critical thinking, clinical judgments, and technical skills. All participants were instructed to perform all appropriate diagnostic and therapeutic actions and verbalize their thoughts and actions. This study focused on assessing the critical thinking abilities of students.

2.3. Scenarios

Students had 1 week of hands-on participation to familiarize themselves with the simulators, represented by an experienced operator prior to the test. During the OSCE, a simulated scenario was conducted in a general ward featuring a high-fidelity simulator. We used the iStan (METI, Medical Education Technologies, Inc., Sarasota, FL, USA), which provides a human-like, full-scale computerized mannequin in a realistic clinical setting. The scenario lasted 15 minutes. Participants were given clear instructions to state the emergency diagnosis and the treatments they were instituting. We presented a 55-year-old man who was admitted to the hospital because of pneumonia complicated by hypotension. Two status respiratory failure and septic shock were shown in the stages. The data, including medication orders, vital signs records, electrocardiograms, and chest radiographs, were collected in the chart. The students needed to assess the patient, including a review of the patient chart, and perform a physical examination. The scenario ended when the patient began a downhill course. Following the station, participants were required to provide a brief summary as a duty note to display the assessment, problems, and plans in an organized format.

2.4. Scoring

Audiovisual recordings were made of each scenario to facilitate scoring and to allow independent review and further analyses. The crisis evaluation and summary of the event and

scoring measures are presented in Appendix 1. Five medically qualified educators designed the written sheet for the patient notes, which included four sections: subjective, objective, diagnosis, and plan. The three-part checklist included a history and physical examination, imperative diagnosis with differential diagnosis, and management of septic shock. Reference resources for evaluating the management of severe sepsis and septic shock skills were based on Surviving Sepsis Campaign International Guidelines [11]. A panel of four experienced physicians using a modified Delphi technique selected and prioritized the passing score. For the OSCE, four experienced raters were formally trained in assessing each examination paper and were given specific instructions on scoring.

Scoring was done on a three-point scale ranging from 0 (failed to perform) to 1 (performed poorly or out of sequence) to 2 (properly performed in correct sequence).

2.5. Data processing and analysis

For descriptive analysis, data from a high-fidelity simulator station was analyzed, including the maximum score, minimum score, mean score, and standard deviation. We compared the pass rate, quality estimation between SP stations, and the high-fidelity simulator station (Table 1). The measure of item difficulty (P) – the proportion of participants, who received credit for the item, was based on the average of the two raters' values. A value of 1 indicated that all students received credit. The second measure was item discrimination (D) – the correlation between the item-level score and the total checklist score. Here, higher values (i.e., $D > 0.30$) indicated that the item was able to discriminate between low- and high-ability individuals. In some instances (i.e., all or no students receiving credit), the D value could not be calculated. The third measure was reliability between inter-rater agreement, which was estimated as the Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient between two administrations of the same measure. A value of 1 indicated that the two raters were in perfect agreement on a particular element

Table 1
Difficulty and discrimination of OSCE and simulation test.

Station	Category	HSG ^a score (no. passed/ pass rate, %)	LSG ^a score (no. passed/ pass rate, %)	(P) ^b	(D) ^c
1a	SP	16/100	15/93.75	0.97	0.0625
1b		15/93.75	10/62.50	0.78	0.3125
2a	SP	16/100	16/100	1	0
2b		16/100	11/68.75	0.84	0.3125
3	SP	16/100	16/100	1	0
4	SP	16/100	15/93.75	0.97	0.0625
5	SP	16/100	16/100	1	0
6a	SP	16/100	13/81.25	0.91	0.1875
6b		16/100	11/68.75	0.84	0.3125
7a	SP	16/100	13/81.25	0.91	0.1875
7b		14/87.5	10/62.50	0.75	0.25
8	SP	16/100	14/87.50	0.94	0.125
9	HFS	14/87.5	6/37.50	0.63	0.5

HFS = high-fidelity simulator; HSG = high-scoring group; LSG = low-scoring group; OSCE = Objective Structured Clinical Examination; SP = standardized patient.

^a Ordered scores of all students from high to low points, select group in first 16 students (27%) as HSG; last 16 students (27%) as LSG.

^b Difficulty (P) = (Pass rate in HSG + Pass rate in LSG)/2 × 100; (1) $p < 0.25$: too difficult; (2) $0.25 < p < 0.4$: difficult; (3) $0.4 < p < 0.7$: appropriate; (4) $0.7 < p < 0.9$: easy; (5) $p > 0.9$: too easy.

^c Discrimination (D) = Pass rate in HSG – Pass rate in LSG/100; (1) > 0.4 : excellent; (2) $0.3–0.39$: good, modify probably; (3) $0.2–0.29$: acceptable, modify often; (4) < 0.19 : poor replace with better one or modify.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/3841934>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/3841934>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)