Student Evaluations, Outcomes, and National Licensure Examinations in Radiology Education: A Narrative Review of the Literature

Kathleen L. Linaker DC, DACBR, PhD*

Dean, Center for Life and Health Sciences, Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica, NY

Received 4 August 2015; received in revised form 18 September 2015; accepted 23 September 2015

Key indexing terms:

Chiropractic;
College admission test;
Curriculum;
Diagnostic imaging;
Education;
Medical;
Internship and residency;
Learning;
Licensure

Abstract

Objective: The purpose of this study was to examine literature on radiological student evaluation and outcome assessments including national board examinations.

Methods: A review of the literature was performed using relevant key words. Articles were retrieved through December 2012 using PubMed, ScienceDirect, ERIC, Proquest, and ICL databases along with a manual review of references.

Results: Of the 4716 unique abstracts reviewed by the author, 54 were found to be relevant to the purpose of this study. Student grade point average correlates with board scores in the nursing, chiropractic, and medical professions. Scores on the chiropractic college admission test and undergraduate grade point average correlate with success in professional college. There is a correlation between board scores and college attended. Board preparation programs do not appear to affect board examination scores.

Conclusion: Although evaluations can be effective teaching tools, they are not used by many radiology programs. Some programs have inadequate evaluations and do not allow students to review their evaluations. There are no definitive links between mastery of radiology and specific evaluations, outcomes, or pre-professional/clinical grades. Studies suggest that board examination scores reflect long-term mastery of knowledge rather than short-term memorization of facts.

© 2015 National University of Health Sciences.

Introduction

Radiology educators have only recently asked questions and sought meaningful answers about how

students learn.^{1,2} As a result, little literature examines how radiology is taught, learned, or evaluated at the resident level, and even fewer articles examine undergraduate radiology education specifically.

There is a substantial amount of similarity found in resident and undergraduate radiology training, and these share similar needs and often use the same resources.³ However, there is currently no review of the literature that summarizes evaluation and outcome assessments for

* Mohawk Valley Community College, 1101 Sherman Dr, PH301D, Utica, NY, 13501-5394. Tel.: +1 716 931 1952; fax: +1 315 792 5697.
E-mail address: katlinaker@gmail.com.

these training programs. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine literature on resident and undergraduate radiological student evaluation and outcome assessments including national board examinations.

Methods

This article reviews literature through 2012 that was retrieved from the MEDLINE, ScienceDirect, ERIC, Proquest, and ICL databases along with manual review of references. The comprehensive sampling strategy used the terms radiology OR diagnostic imaging AND education OR teaching OR resident OR medical student OR chiropractic student OR curriculum OR medical education OR medical school OR medical students OR medical curriculum OR chiropractic education, OR chiropractic school OR chiropractic students OR chiropractic curriculum. Articles were limited to those in the English language and to humans.

Results

The resultant 4716 unique article abstracts and/or titles were reviewed by the author. All articles that appeared germane to student evaluations, outcomes, and national licensure examinations in radiology education were obtained and reviewed by the author, which led to the inclusion of 54 articles in this paper.

Discussion

Evaluations and Outcomes

Evaluation tools such as examinations, case presentations, and periodic performance evaluations can be used as both evaluations of performance^{4–9} and effective teaching tools.^{7,10–14} Some programs require that residents complete “credentialing examinations” at set times during their residency; these examinations serve to document residents’ proficiency before they are allowed to interpret films within a given department.¹⁵

Although the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education requires that radiology residents receive formal evaluations at least 4 times a year,¹⁶ 22% of programs appear not to enforce this policy,¹⁷ and only approximately 25% provide the residents with copies of these evaluations. However, 92% allowed the resident to

view the evaluations. A 2012 study found that students prefer that radiology examinations be both summative and formative, thus allowing them to learn from their mistakes and address identified areas of weakness.¹⁴ The importance of timely, useful feedback is well understood in the educational literature.^{18,19} Similarly, a 2007 survey of clerkship directors²⁰ found that only 33% of clerkships assessed chest radiology interpretation skills even when these were covered within the clerkship. Interestingly, electronic evaluation systems appear to improve both the response rate and timeliness with no impact on the quality of responses when compared with paper-based evaluation systems.²¹

A few researchers examined the importance of evaluation and the correlation of various evaluations with student outcomes. For example, resident rotation evaluation scores appear to correlate with the American Board of Radiology standardized written examination,^{22,23} and student scores on a radiology station in a Comprehensive Clinical Skills Assessment correlated with National Board Examinations and grade point average (GPA),²⁴ whereas applicant rank order (how a resident compared against his or her peers during the residency matching process) does not correlate with these examinations.²⁵ Preclinical medical school grades of honors/A grades in anatomy and pathology show some degree of correlation with radiology board scores, as do honors grades in some clinical courses and student scores on the United States Medical Licensure Examination.^{26,27}

Other discussions of possible correlation of outcomes focus on the impact of pre-radiology clinical year(s) on radiology resident performance.^{5,28} However, this discussion is mainly editorial in nature, with a handful of equivocal studies looking at outcomes. A few researchers examine possible preexisting factors relating to radiology residents’ success, in particular, their perceptual abilities.²⁹ These articles revealed the possibility of improving resident selection by discriminating, in a very preliminary manner, between applicants based on their perceptual aptitude.^{30–32}

Method of examination delivery is also discussed mainly in relation to the conversion of the profession to digital image delivery for interpretation, education, and evaluation. These articles focus on the ease of digital examination style in relation to creating and proctoring the examinations, as well as the cost effectiveness of the examination delivery.³³

Researchers explore the relationships of examination style in radiology to measuring student mastery levels and other factors involved in undergraduate evaluations. One author in particular examines the differences in students’ perception of examination style on their level of

examination preparedness, anxiety levels, and study habits in relation to a practical radiology examination.³⁴ Peterson³⁴ found a minimal difference in students' anxiety levels with the open-book format vs the closed-book format, whereas the remainder of the variables remained unaffected. The examination style consisted of short-answer questions, problem solving, and case-based questions. A study examining student perceptions in regard to learning radiology found that students believe that their mastery of the material is directly linked to their perception of the difficulty level of the examination and thus the effort they put into preparing for the examination, a phenomenon known as *strategic studying* in educational literature.¹⁴ An interesting pair of articles describes the use of a clinical competency examination in radiology in the undergraduate setting.^{35,36} These researchers presented the creation and implementation of such an examination and discussed the results of the pilot examination. The authors were able to arrive at 2 conclusions: first, that the use of content-based curricula may result in poor clinical competency and, secondly, that the implementation of ongoing clinical competency measures must be administered regularly within a given curriculum. A recent article described the reliability and validity of an x-ray difficulty scale for selecting chest radiographs for examinations,³⁷ a useful tool for creating examinations of appropriate difficulty for a given set of students. The University of Michigan Medical School has shown that adding a 15-minute case of the week, taught by radiology faculty, significantly improved the students' comprehensive clinical assessment examination scores.³⁸

National Board Examinations

Several authors have found that student GPA in chiropractic education correlates well with board scores.^{39–42} This has also been demonstrated by a variety of authors in both the nursing^{43–46} and medical professions.¹ In addition, just as scores on the chiropractic college admission test correlate with success in professional college and on board examinations,^{47,48} so, too, does undergraduate GPA.^{40,49–53} A study published in 1979⁵⁴ found a correlation between board scores and the college the students attended. Board preparation programs do not appear to affect board examination scores.^{49,51} These studies suggest that national board examination scores are reflective of long-term mastery of knowledge rather than short-term memorization of facts.

Limitations

This study was limited to articles available in the English language and therefore is not comprehensive of all literature worldwide. The search did not include the gray literature or other potentially relevant sources. It is possible that the search terms did not identify all relevant articles.

Conclusions

Evaluations can be used as effective teaching tools; however, many radiology programs are not using them in this manner. Some undergraduate and residency programs have inadequate evaluations and often do not allow students to review their evaluations. In addition, no definitive conclusions have been found linking mastery of radiology with any specific evaluation, outcome, or pre-professional or preclinical grades. This area of research is markedly understudied, and the little research completed only offers preliminary clues for areas to examine in future research.

Funding Sources and Conflicts of Interest

No funding sources or conflicts of interest were reported for this study.

References

1. Calhoun JG, Vydareny KH, Ten Haken JD, Blane CE. Journal publications in radiology education. A review of the literature, 1966-1986. *Invest Radiol* 1988;23(1):62–7.
2. Collins J, Kazerooni EA, Vydareny KH, Blane CE, Albanese MA, Prucha CE. Journal publications in radiologic education: a review of the literature, 1987-1997. *Acad Radiol* 2001;8(1):31–41.
3. Collins J, Riebe JD, Albanese MA, et al. Medical students and radiology residents: can they learn as effectively with the same educational materials? *Acad Radiol* 1999;6(11):691–5.
4. Blane CE, Calhoun JG. Objectively evaluating student case presentations. *Invest Radiol* 1985;20(2).
5. Cuttino JT, Scatliff JH. First year radiology residents: PGI vs. PGII. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1979;132(5):855–6.
6. Williamson KB, Steele JL, Gunderman RB, et al. Assessing radiology resident reporting skills. *Radiology* 2002;225(3):719–22.
7. Curtis DJ, Amis ES, Cruess DF, Riordan DD. Evaluation of radiology resident cognitive performance. *Invest Radiol* 1985;20(6):640–2.

8. Cuttino JT, Scatliff JH. Resident performance evaluation. *Invest Radiol* 1987;22(12):986–9.
9. Littrell TA. Measuring improvement of radiographic interpretive skills: a feasibility study. *J Chiropr Educ* 2003;17:21.
10. Barnhard HJ. Radiology residency approval: desirability of feedback from the American Board Of Radiology Examinations. *Radiology* 1974;112(2):451–2.
11. Blane CE, Calhoun JG, Maxim BR, Martel W, Davis WK. Systematic evaluation and increased structure in a radiology elective. *Invest Radiol* 1985;20(3).
12. Curtis DJ, Riordan DD, Brower AC, Amis ES. Testing as a teaching tool. *Invest Radiol* 1988;23(2):151–3.
13. Blane CE, Calhoun JG, Vydareny KH. Constructing pre- and post-tests in a medical student elective. *Invest Radiol* 1986;21(9):743–5.
14. Linaker KL. Shades of grey: an exploration of the student learning experience in diagnostic imaging education. (doctoral dissertation) Chicago: Loyola University of Chicago; 2012 [Available from: http://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1307&context=luc_diss].
15. Amis Jr ES, Alderson PO. In-house testing in emergency radiology. A method for teaching and credentialing radiology residents. *Invest Radiol* 1991;26:836–9.
16. Collins J, Propeck PA, Albanese MA. Radiology resident performance reviews. *Acad Radiol* 2000;7(5):350–2.
17. Collins J, Herring W, Kwakwa F, et al. Current practices in evaluating radiology residents, faculty, and programs: results of a survey of radiology residency program directors. *Acad Radiol* 2004;11(7):787–94.
18. Bellon JJ, Bellon EC, Blank MA. Teaching from a research knowledge base: a development and renewal process. New York, Toronto, New York, Merrill, Maxwell Macmillan Canada: Maxwell Macmillan International; 1992.
19. Higgins R, Hartley P, Skelton A. The conscientious consumer: reconsidering the role of assessment feedback in student learning. *Stud High Educ* 2002;27(1):53–64.
20. O'Brien KE, Cannarozzi ML, Torre DM, Mechaber AJ, Durning SJ. Training and assessment of CXR/basic radiology interpretation skills: results from the 2005 CDIM Survey. *Teach Learn Med* 2008;20(2).
21. Boiselle PM, Mainiero MB. Impact of electronic resident evaluation systems on the timeliness, rate, and quality of responses. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2006;3(10):807–11.
22. Adusumilli S1, Cohan RH, Korobkin M, Fitzgerald JT, Oh MS. Correlation between radiology resident rotation performance and examination scores. *Acad Radiol* 2000;7(11):920–6 [<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11089694>].
23. Baumgartner BR, Peterman SB. Relationship between American College of Radiology in-training examination scores and American Board of Radiology written examination scores. Part 2. Multi-institutional study. *Acad Radiol* 1998;5(5):374–9.
24. Blane CE, Fitzgerald JT, Bowerman RA, et al. Performance on the radiology component of a critical clinical skills examination. *Acad Radiol* 1996;3(11):958–61.
25. Adusumilli S, Cohan RH, Marshall KW, et al. How well does applicant rank order predict subsequent performance during radiology residency? *Acad Radiol* 2000;7(8):635–40.
26. Patterson SK, Fitzgerald JT, Boyse TD, Cohan RH. Is past academic productivity predictive of radiology resident academic productivity? *Acad Radiol* 2002;9(2):211–6.
27. Boyse TD, Patterson SK, Cohan RH, et al. Does medical school performance predict radiology resident performance? *Acad Radiol* 2002;9(4):437–45.
28. Ellis JH, Vydareny KH, Bookstein FL, Gross BH. Impact of pre-radiology clinical years on resident performance. *Invest Radiol* 1989;24(7):568–74.
29. Brazeau-Lamontagne L, Charlin B, Gagnon R, Samson L, van der Vleuten C. Measurement of perception and interpretation skills during radiology training: utility of the script concordance approach. *Med Teach* 2004;26(4):326–32.
30. Berbaum KS, Smoker WR, Smith WL. Measurement and prediction of diagnostic performance during radiology training. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1985;145(6):1305–11.
31. Smoker W, Berbaum K, Luebke N, Jacoby C. Spatial perception testing in diagnostic radiology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1984;143:1105–9.
32. Smith WL, Berbaum KS. Improving resident selection. Discrimination by perceptual abilities. *Invest Radiol* 1991;26(10):910–2.
33. Novelline RA, Scheiner JD, Mehta A, Mullins M. Preparing medical students for a filmless environment: instruction on the preparation of electronic case presentations from PACS. *Acad Radiol* 2001;8(3):266–8.
34. Peterson C. Influences of an open-book practical radiology examination on student anxiety levels, study approaches, and overall performance. *J Chiropr Educ* 2004;18:24–5.
35. Marchiori DM, Henderson CN, Adams TL. Developing a clinical competency examination in radiology: part II—test results. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1999;22(2):63–74.
36. Marchiori DM, Adams TL, Henderson CN. Developing a clinical competency examination in radiology: part I—test structure. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1999;22(2):57–62.
37. Boutis K, Pecaric M, Pusic M. Teaching x-ray interpretation: selecting the radiographs by the target population. *Med Educ* 2009;43(5):434–41.
38. Rochester AB, Roubidoux MA, Fitzgerald JT, Blane CE, Bowerman RA, McQuillan M. Value of case-of-the-week presentations on the radiology component of the Comprehensive Clinical Assessment examination. *Acad Radiol* 1998;5(3):169–72.
39. Kalthoff TJ. National board scores versus student GPA's in chiropractic education. *Coll Univ* 1985;61(1):61–7.
40. Lawson DM, Till H. Predictors of performance of students from the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College on the licensure examinations of the Canadian Chiropractic Examining Board. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2006;29(7):566–9.
41. Wolfenberger V. Correlations between Chiropractic National Board (part I) scores and basic science course grades and related data. *Coll Univ* 1999;74(2):16–20.
42. Lawson DM, McDonald C, Naseem MT. Comparing the performance of graduates of American chiropractic colleges to that of English-speaking graduates of the Canadian chiropractic college on Canadian licensure examinations. *J Chiropr Educ* 2003;17:20.
43. Melcolm N, Venn R, Bausell RB. The prediction of state board test pool examinations scores within an integrated curriculum. *J Nurs Educ* 1981;20(5):24–8.
44. Muhlenkamp AF. Prediction of State Board scores in a baccalaureate program. *Nurs Outlook* 1971;19(1).
45. Outtz JH. Predicting the success on state board examinations for blacks. *J Nurs Educ* 1979;18(9):35–40.
46. Seither FF. Prediction of achievement in baccalaureate nursing education. *J Nurs Educ* 1980;19(3):28–36.

47. Cunningham KA. Evaluating the predictive validity of CCAT scores in pre-clinical chiropractic education. Thesis [Ph. D.] Iowa City: Graduate College. University of Iowa; 2003.
48. Cunningham KA, DesJardins SL, Christensen MG. Predictive efficacy of Chiropractic College Assessment Test scores in basic science chiropractic education. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2005;28(3):175–8.
49. Cunningham KA, Percuoco RE, Marchiori DM, Christensen MG. A preliminary analysis of preparation strategies and other correlates to performance on a basic science qualifying exam in chiropractic. *J Allied Health* 2006;35(1):e59–72.
50. Jensen DJ. Predictors of academic success in chiropractic college. Thesis (Ph. D.) School of Education, University of Missouri-Kansas City; 1988.
51. Cunningham KA, Percuoco RE, Marchiori DM, Christensen M. A preliminary analysis of preparation strategies used by chiropractic students in preparing for NBCE part I. *J Chiropr Educ* 2004;18:5.
52. Green BN, Johnson CD, McCarthy K. Predicting academic success in the first year of chiropractic college. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2003;26(1):40–6.
53. Schoof TD, Eubanks EE. Predictability of student performance on the National Chiropractic Board exam based on chiropractic college admissions requirements. Thesis (Ed. D.) School of Education. University of Missouri Kansas City; 2002.
54. Coulter I, Delgrande J. The Canadian Chiropractic Examination Board results: a statistical evaluation. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1979;23(4):143–9.