Using the CIPP Evaluation Model to Advance Innovation in Medical and Graduate Education

Nikki Zaidi, PhD; Paula Ross, PhD; Helen Morgan, MD; Rajesh Mangrulkar, MD
Office of Medical Student Education, University of Michigan Medical School

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.

Methods

- We adopted a decision-oriented approach, using the **context/input/process/product (CIPP)**[1] 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.

Lessons Learned

- RISE must stretch **beyond modest improvement** and continuous quality improvement measures to impact health.
- **Translational medical education**[2] 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**.

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

CIPP Evaluation	Guiding Questions	Results
CONTEXT assess needs, assets, and problems within defined environment	• What needs of society can be/were addressed through innovation in medical education? • 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 assess potential resources and strategies	• What are/were approaches to meeting the identified need(s)? • How feasible is/was each of the identified approaches, given the specific context of the need?	Adopted the translational education framework[2] to guide innovation in medical education at Michigan Medicine
PROCESS monitor, document, and assess program activities	• How is/was the program implemented, compared to the plan? • Can/did participants accept and carry out their roles? • What implementation problems have been/were encountered? • How do/did participants perceive program quality?	Will soon implement and support all aspects of RISE (research, innovation, scholarship and education)
PRODUCT measure, interpret, and judge outcomes	• What positive and negative outcomes of the program are/were identified? • Are/were there unintended outcomes? • What are/were short-and long-term implications of program outcomes? • How sustainable is/was the program?	Will soon establish a Community of Practice that engages in and supports a culture of innovation

References

1. Stufflebeam, DL, Shinkfield, AJ. 2007. Evaluation theory, models and applications. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
2. McGaghie WC. Medical education research as translational science. Sci Transl Med 2010; 2(1):1-3.