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Assessment of final year medical students in a simulated ward: developing content validity for an assessment instrument

Introduction

Despite changes in undergraduate curricula and assessment, the United Kingdom is still graduating medical students who are ‘unfit for practice’ in their pre-registration year1 suggesting that there is a failure in identifying them at undergraduate level. Whilst work place based assessment is the most authentic method of testing performance, the tools available are limited to postgraduate assessment2,3. At undergraduate level, Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) are currently the mainstay of sampling different competencies4. The OSCE has a standardised format, is reliable, reproducible and feasible5 but can only demonstrate the examination or management of one patient at any one time. None of the postgraduate or undergraduate instruments currently assess a candidate’s ability to perform in a pressurised ward environment, when caring for more than one patient simultaneously.

Simulation has been successfully used to provide a safe, realistic, learner-centred health care context.6,7 Within the Clinical Skills Centre in Dundee we have developed a simulated ward to reflect a real ward environment and provide an opportunity to observe how a student would perform when responsible for the care of several patients simultaneously. It has been evaluated positively by pre-registration house officers8 previously and anecdotally reported by consultant physicians as replicating how junior doctors perform on the real ward. At present, the simulated ward is used as a learning environment but has the potential to be developed for use in assessment to highlight the students that need more support prior to graduation. We have developed a standardised simulated ward exercise using simulated patients and a medium fidelity simulator where the final year medical student is given a handover and asked to manage the patient for the next 25 minutes as if they were the Foundation Year 1 doctor. The simulation is videoed for review and feedback. This exercise provides an opportunity to assess the students individually on their performance representing the ‘does’ in the top tier for Miller’s pyramid9.

Van der Vleuten has described the five criteria for an assessment tool10, one of which is validity. An assessment tool can only be valid if the items against which a student is assessed are themselves valid. This paper describes the development of valid assessment criteria using a modified Delphi method.

Methodology

A Modified Delphi Method was used to develop valid criteria for the assessment instrument for the simulated ward exercise. There are many descriptions of the Delphi Method and its modifications11. The method used in this study is shown in Figure 1.

Initial Generation of List of Items

For this item determination study, expert opinion was initially harnessed through the formation of an expert group.

An expert was defined as a professional with
1. Up to date knowledge of the requirements of a final year medical student
2. Up to date knowledge of the requirements of a junior doctor on a medical ward (both of the GMC requirements and the day to day role)
3. An awareness of the ward simulation exercise.

The importance however, of generating ‘correct’ items is so fundamental to the assessment process that the suggestions from the expert group were further validated by additional experts.

The members of the expert group were asked to define the required
attributes of a junior doctor that could be demonstrated in the ward simulation exercise. Each item had to be singular, so that the student either did, or did not fulfill the criteria. The experts were circulated electronic and paper versions of the questionnaire to improve response rate.

The items generated were collated into manageable groups by the monitor and one member of the expert group.

Circulation of Items to Additional Experts
The additional experts were asked to rate the items for assessment in the ward simulation exercise against the following scale.

1. Not relevant
2. Unable to assess relevance without item revision or item in need of such revision that it would no longer be relevant
3. Relevant but needs minor alteration
4. Very relevant and succinct.

Comments were invited on individual or additional items. The individual ratings were collated by the monitor. The monitor was unconnected to either group of experts, to reduce the risk of bias. Items were altered as appropriate, and recirculated until consensus was reached. The cut-off was chosen prior to commencement of the study as 80% of responders rating the item ‘3’ or ‘4’. Items achieving less than this were removed.

Results

Expert Group: The initial expert group comprised 4 senior health care professionals experienced in medical education. 36 items were generated by the expert group.

Second Expert Group: This group comprised experts with the same criteria as the first group, but who had not originally been involved. There were 10 who received the questionnaire representing a broad area of expertise in general practice and hospital medicine. All members of the expert group had a significant involvement in the assessment of undergraduate medical students in their senior years.

9 (90%) responded. After 2 rounds, all items received a rating of 3 or 4 from ≥80% of the clinicians asked (≥89% of those who responded). The items are shown in Table 1.
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| Initial generation of a list of items |
| Circulation of this list of items to additional ‘experts’ |
| Anonymous rating of the relevance of each item |
| Collation of ratings by monitor |
| Alterations/Removal/Addition of items |
| Recirculation for re-rating until consensus reached |

Table 1. Modified Delphi Result

| General |
| 1. The doctor forms an initial overview of the ward using all information available |
| 2. The doctor prioritises appropriately |
| 3. The doctor performs all essential tasks |
| 4. The doctor gives clear and concise handover at the end |

| Clinical Skills |
| 5. The doctor takes an effective history |
| 6. The doctor examines appropriately |
| 7. The doctor performs clinical procedures competently |
| 8. The doctor initiates appropriate investigations |
| 9. The doctor demonstrates competency in interpreting results |
| 10. The doctor makes informed decisions using appropriate information |

| Critically Ill Patient |
| 11. The doctor recognises that the patient is sick |
| 12. The doctor makes an appropriate assessment of the critically ill patient |
| 13. The doctor resuscitates the critically ill patient appropriately |
| 14. The doctor manages the emergency within an appropriate timeframe |
| 15. The doctor seeks help appropriately |

| Prescribing/written documentation |
| 16. The doctor prescribes safely |
| 17. The doctor prescribes appropriately |
| 18. The doctor records appropriately in notes |
| 19. The doctor completes written tasks appropriately |
| 20. The doctor recognises mistakes/errors |

| Response to interruptions |
| 21. The doctor responds appropriately to timed interruptions |
| 22. The doctor follows up timed interruptions appropriately |
| 23. The doctor reacts appropriately to nursing observations |

| Communication |
| 24. The doctor gives clear instructions |
| 25. The doctor demonstrates appropriate listening skills |
| 26. The doctor communicates appropriately with team members |
| 27. The doctor works well with nursing colleague |
| 28. The doctor communicates appropriately with patients or relatives |
| 29. The doctor has appropriate language skills |
| 30. The doctor treats patient with appropriate respect |
| 31. The doctor respects the patient's privacy |
| 32. The doctor respects the patient's confidentiality |

| Health and Safety |
| 33. The doctor demonstrates safe practice |
| 34. The doctor takes sufficient care to prevent cross-infection |
| 35. The doctor demonstrates good handwashing procedures |
| 36. The doctor demonstrates insight into errors |

The second group of experts expressed potential difficulty with the terms “appropriate”, “essential”, “competently” and “sufficient”, but agreed that clarification with the examiners prior to any assessment would minimise this.

One addition was suggested by the members of the expert panel of “The doctor adhered to appropriate local prescribing guideline”. It was agreed that this item should be included under Item 17 “the doctor prescribes appropriately”. No other items were added.
Discussion

This study has produced 36 items for development of the assessment tool for use in a simulated ward environment. Whilst it could be argued that these items are “expert opinion rather than indisputable fact”,12 they represent a consensus of opinion of a body of experts. This consensus has been derived by a process recognised as acceptable worldwide when accurate, precise information is unavailable. The experts were drawn from those professionals involved across the fields of undergraduate and postgraduate medical education. This group was limited however, to those who had experience of the ward simulation exercise. Patients and other lay people were not included as it was felt that they were not sufficiently expert in any of the areas.

Within the health care environment, the consensus building enabled by the Delphi Method has been used widely. It has led to national curriculum development in a variety of areas13,14,15 and has been used in the development of assessments using simulation16.

The anonymous nature of the questionnaire is designed to encourage the contributor to ‘voice’ their opinion, something which they may be reluctant to do in the context of a face to face group meeting. However, McKenna’s description is perhaps more accurate of the ‘quasi-anonymity’ of this stage, as the monitor is aware of the identity of the individual responder17.

The monitor and one of the members of the expert group did collate the items under domain headings. This has the potential to cause bias in the marking of the questionnaire by the experts, as it may produce a ‘halo effect’18. It is difficult to assess this, and there are indeed two domains marking of the questionnaire by the experts, as it may produce a ‘halo effect’18. The simulated ward exercise is not designed as a panacea for the items. The return rate of 90% suggests keen participation in the context of a face to face group meeting. However, McKenna’s description is perhaps more accurate of the ‘quasi-anonymity’ of this stage, as the monitor is aware of the identity of the individual responder17.

There appears to be very clear consensus in the items, and while this is encouraging, it perhaps suggests that the initial expert group were too restrictive with their items, and could have suggested more. In an attempt to counterbalance this suggestion however, it must be pointed out that each member of the second expert group receiving the questionnaire was given a blank space on the form to add any suggestions and only added one, perhaps confirming that the initial expert panel identified all the possible items. The return rate of 90% suggests keen participation in the study by this second expert group rather than disinterest in the items.

Some concern was expressed by the participants over the wording of the items, in particular those using “appropriate”, “essential”, “competent” and “sufficient” but it has been agreed that these are important concepts in the ethos of the ward simulation exercise, where there is not only one ‘correct way’. Future studies will be required to determine whether these concerns are justified, and could be dealt with training and explanation of the items to the examiners before marking the students. This tool will have a subjective element but is intended to be used by clinicians used to making expert judgments.

Conclusion

This study has generated a set of items (criteria) for a new assessment in the simulated ward environment. These have been derived by consensus of practicing clinicians using a validated Delphi method ensuring validity of the items. The simulated ward exercise is not designed as a panacea for undergraduate assessment, but to provide a safe, realistic environment in which to assess senior medical students. The description of the items and the method of their derivation should ensure transferability of the assessment to other institutions. Further validation of the simulated ward environment as an assessment tool is underway.
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