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Background

• Innovation in medical education can address major health problems by disrupting the status quo and creating meaningful impact on learning and health.
• Michigan Medicine has launched R.I.S.E. (Research. Innovation. Scholarship. Education) to promote innovation in medical education.
• A robust program evaluation was implemented to understand how innovation in medical and graduate education can impact societal health problems.

Lessons Learned

• RISE must stretch beyond modest improvement and continuous quality improvement measures to impact health.
• Translational medical education is necessary to transfer the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and professionalism to healthcare practices to impact health.
• We must implement activities to support a Community of Practice.

Methods

• We adopted a decision-oriented approach, using the context/input/process/product (CIPP) evaluation model which involved guiding questions outlined in Table 1.

Results

• As outlined in Table 1, we have some initial results from the (C) Context and (I) Input evaluation phases.

Future Application and Next Steps

• We will soon commence the (P) Process phase to evaluate implementation and support for the RISE mission.
• Then, we will employ the (P) Product phase to measure outcome metrics for determining whether our initiative is succeeding.
• We will evaluate the overall success of this initiative based on the engagement and products of our Community of Practice.
• We will also employ the CIPP framework for evaluation of the specific innovation projects supported by RISE.

Table 1. CIPP Model for RISE Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIPP Evaluation</th>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONTEXT         | • What needs of society can be/were addressed through innovation in medical education?  
| assess needs, assets, and problems within defined environment | • What are/were impediments to meeting these needs?  
|                 | • What pertinent expertise, services, or other assets are/were available?            | Consulted a diverse group of stakeholders (>150 individuals) who indicated that we need to help learners meet the healthcare needs of society |
| INPUT           | • What are/were approaches to meeting the identified need(s)?  
| assess potential resources and strategies                   | • How feasible is/was each of the identified approaches, given the specific context of the need? | Adopted the translational education framework to guide innovation in medical education at Michigan Medicine |
| PROCESS         | • How is/was the program implemented, compared to the plan?  
| monitor, document, and assess program activities             | • Can/did participants accept and carry out their roles?  
|                 | • What implementation problems have been/were encountered?  
|                 | • How do/did participants perceive program quality? |
| PRODUCT         | • What positive and negative outcomes of the program are/were identified?  
| measure, interpret, and judge outcomes                      | • Are/were there unintended outcomes?  
|                 | • What are/were short-and long-term implications of program outcomes?  
|                 | • How sustainable is/was the program?  |
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