Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2025) 15(6), 3735-3738 | ISSN:2251-6727

Assessment in Medical Education: From Measurement to Learning Systems

Dr. Beenish Mukhtar

Department of Basic Medical Sciences, College of Medicine,

Dar Al-Uloom University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

(Received: 05 November 2025 Revised: 15 December 2025 Accepted: 30 December 2025)

KEYWORDS

Medical education, Assessment, Competency -based education, Programmat ic assessment, Workplace-based assessment

ABSTRACT:

Assessment is central to medical education, influencing learning behavior, curriculum alignment, and professional competence. Over recent decades, assessment has evolved from predominantly summative, knowledge-based examinations to multifaceted systems aligned with competency-based medical education (CBME). This review critically examines traditional and contemporary assessment methods used in undergraduate and postgraduate medical education, emphasizing their validity, reliability, educational impact, and feasibility in large cohorts. Written assessments, Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs), workplace-based assessments (WBAs), portfolios, peer and self-assessment, and technology-enhanced tools are compared across competency domains. Emerging concepts such as programmatic assessment, assessment for learning, and multisource feedback are discussed in relation to modern healthcare demands. Persistent challenges, including faculty workload, standardization, and equity, are highlighted. The review concludes that an integrated, programmatic approach to assessment is essential to ensure the development of competent, reflective, and practice-ready medical graduates.

1. Introduction

Assessment lies at the heart of medical education and is widely acknowledged as a key driver of student learning [1]. Traditionally, assessment practices focused on measuring knowledge acquisition through high-stakes summative examinations. While such approaches ensured standardization and accountability, they were limited in their ability to assess complex clinical competencies required in contemporary medical practice [2].

The global shift toward competency-based medical education (CBME) has transformed expectations from assessment systems. Assessment is now expected not only to certify competence but also to support learning, provide meaningful feedback, and ensure patient safety [3]. Consequently, medical education has witnessed a transition from isolated assessment tools toward longitudinal, integrated assessment systems that better reflect real-world clinical practice [4].

This review synthesizes current evidence on assessment methods in medical education, critically examining their theoretical foundations, practical applications, and educational impact. The aim is to inform educators and institutions seeking to design robust, learner-centered assessment systems aligned with CBME principles.

2. Conceptual Foundations of Assessment

Assessment in medical education is best understood as a system rather than a collection of individual tools [5]. Miller's Pyramid provides a useful framework for mapping assessment methods across levels of competence: knows, knows how, shows how, and does [6]. Written examinations predominantly assess knowledge, whereas performance-based and workplace-based assessments target higher levels of clinical competence.

Modern validity theory emphasizes that validity is a unified construct encompassing content, response process, internal structure, relationships to other variables, and consequences of assessment [7]. This perspective underscores that assessment quality depends not only on psychometric properties but also on educational impact and fairness.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2025) 15(6), 3735-3738 | ISSN:2251-6727

3. Formative and Summative Assessment

3.1 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment aims to support learning by providing timely, specific, and actionable feedback [8]. Evidence suggests that effective formative feedback can significantly improve learner performance and promote self-regulated learning [9]. Common formative tools include reflective portfolios, mini-CEX, DOPS, peer assessment, and low-stakes OSCE stations.

Despite its educational value, formative assessment requires substantial faculty engagement and institutional support. Without a strong feedback culture, formative assessments risk becoming superficial administrative exercises rather than meaningful learning encounters [10].

3.2 Summative Assessment

Summative assessment serves certification, progression, and accountability purposes [11]. Traditionally, undergraduate medical education relied heavily on end-of-year high-stakes examinations. However, excessive reliance on summative assessment has been associated with surface learning and increased learner anxiety [12]. Contemporary best practice supports the integration of summative decisions with aggregated formative data to enhance validity and educational impact [13].

4. Written Assessment Methods

4.1 Essay and Modified Essay Questions

Long essay and modified essay questions allow assessment of integrative knowledge and clinical reasoning [14]. However, they demonstrate lower reliability due to examiner variability and limited content sampling. Consequently, their role in high-stakes assessment is increasingly questioned [15].

4.2 Short Answer Questions, MCQs, and EMQs

Multiple-choice questions (MCQs) and extended matching questions (EMQs) remain widely used due to their feasibility and scalability [16]. When well constructed, these formats can assess higher-order cognitive skills and demonstrate strong reliability. However, they are limited in their ability to assess clinical performance and professional behaviors [17].

5. Performance-Based Clinical Assessment

5.1 Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE)

The OSCE is a well-established method for assessing clinical competence at the “shows how” level of Miller’s pyramid [18]. Reliability improves with adequate station sampling, with studies reporting Cronbach’s alpha values exceeding 0.80 when 12–16 stations are used [19]. Despite strong validity, OSCEs are resource-intensive and challenging to implement in large cohorts [20].

5.2 Oral Examinations and Case-Based Assessments

Traditional viva voce examinations and long cases provide authenticity but suffer from poor reliability and susceptibility to examiner bias [21]. Structured oral examinations and standardized scoring rubrics have been proposed to improve objectivity, though widespread adoption remains limited [22].

6. Workplace-Based Assessment

Workplace-based assessments (WBAs) aim to capture authentic clinical performance in real practice settings [23]. Tools such as mini-CEX, DOPS, case-based discussion, and multisource feedback are integral to CBME frameworks. Research suggests that multiple observations across contexts and assessors are required to achieve acceptable reliability [24]. The educational value of WBAs is highly dependent on the quality of feedback provided [25].

7. Portfolios, Peer, and Self-Assessment

Portfolios support longitudinal documentation of competence and reflective practice [26]. When integrated with mentoring and feedback, portfolios enhance professional identity formation and lifelong learning skills [27]. Peer and self-assessment promote critical reflection and collaborative learning, though concerns regarding bias and credibility persist [28]. Structured rubrics and faculty oversight are essential to ensure trustworthiness [29].

8. Programmatic Assessment

Programmatic assessment represents a paradigm shift in medical education assessment [30]. It integrates multiple low-stakes assessments over time, with high-stakes decisions based on aggregated data rather than

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2025) 15(6), 3735-3738 | ISSN:2251-6727

single examination events. This approach enhances validity, supports learning, and aligns closely with CBME principles [31]. However, implementation requires institutional commitment, faculty development, and robust data management systems [32].

9. Challenges in Medical Student Assessment

Medical schools face increasing student numbers, limited faculty availability, and growing clinical service demands [33]. These challenges threaten the sustainability of resource-intensive assessment methods. Technology-enhanced assessments and peer-supported models offer potential solutions but raise concerns regarding standardization, equity, and data security [34].

10. Future Directions

The future of assessment lies in intelligent integration. Learning analytics, artificial intelligence–supported feedback, and entrustment-based decision systems are emerging innovations [35]. While promising, these technologies must be grounded in educational theory and ethical practice to ensure fairness and transparency [36].

Conclusion

Assessment in medical education has evolved from a measurement-focused activity to a complex, learning-oriented system central to professional development. No single assessment method can adequately capture the multidimensional nature of clinical competence. A programmatic, competency-aligned approach that integrates formative and summative elements offers the most robust solution. Ongoing research, faculty development, and institutional support are essential to ensure assessment systems remain valid, fair, and educationally impactful, ultimately safeguarding patient care.

REFERENCES

1. Friedman BDM. The assessment of medical competence. **Med Teach**. 2000;22(5):472–7.
2. Harlen W. Teachers' summative practices and assessment for learning. **Curric J**. 2005;16(2):207–23.
3. Leung WC. Competency based medical training: review. **BMJ**. 2002;325(7366):693–6.
4. Ferris H, O'Flynn D. Assessment in medical education: what are we trying to achieve? **Int J High Educ**. 2015;4(2):139–44.
5. Norcini JJ. Setting standards on educational tests. **Med Educ**. 2003;37(5):539–43.
6. Miller GE. The assessment of clinical skills/competence/performance. **Acad Med**. 1990;65(9 Suppl):S63–7.
7. Messick S. Validity. In: Linn RL, editor. **Educational Measurement**. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan; 1994. p. 13–103.
8. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment for learning. **Educ Assess**. 2002;8(1):1–32.
9. Hattie J, Timperley H. The power of feedback. **Rev Educ Res**. 2007;77(1):81–112.
10. Saedon H, Salleh S, Balakrishnan A, Imray CH. The role of feedback in improving the effectiveness of workplace-based assessments. **BMC Med Educ**. 2012;12:25.
11. Wass V, Van der Vleuten C, Shatzer J, Jones R. Assessment of clinical competence. **Lancet**. 2001;357(9260):945–9.
12. Schuwirth LWT, van der Vleuten CPM. Changing education, changing assessment, changing research? **Med Educ**. 2004;38(8):805–12.
13. van der Vleuten CPM, Schuwirth LWT, Driessen EW, Govaerts MJB, Heeneman S. Twelve tips for programmatic assessment. **Med Teach**. 2012;34(3):205–14.
14. Knox JD. Assessment of clinical competence. **Med Teach**. 1980;2(1):20–4.
15. Case SM, Swanson DB. **Constructing Written Test Questions for the Basic and Clinical Sciences**. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: NBME; 2001.
16. Schuwirth LWT, van der Vleuten CPM. Written assessment. **Med Educ**. 2005;39(6):643–9.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2025) 15(6), 3735-3738 | ISSN:2251-6727

17. Cook DA, Beckman TJ, Bordage G. Quality of evidence supporting validity of assessments. **Acad Med**. 2010;85(3):S36–43.
18. Newble D. Techniques for measuring clinical competence: objective structured clinical examinations. **Med Educ**. 2004;38(2):199–203.
19. Harden RM, Gleeson FA. Assessment of clinical competence using an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE). **Med Educ**. 1979;13(1):41–54.
20. Rees C, Shepherd M. The acceptability of OSCEs to students. **Med Educ**. 2005;39(1):49–57.
21. de Silva V, Hanwella R. Assessment of clinical competence. **Sri Lanka J Psychiatry**. 2012;2(1):15–19.
22. Norcini JJ, Blank LL, Duffy FD, Fortna GS. The mini-CEX. **Ann Intern Med**. 2003;138(6):476–81.
23. Holmboe ES, Sherbino J, Long DM, Swing SR, Frank JR. The role of assessment in competency-based medical education. **Acad Med**. 2010;85(9):1362–8.
24. Davis MH, Ponnamperuma G. Portfolio assessment. In: Dent JA, Harden RM, editors. **A Practical Guide for Medical Teachers**. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Elsevier; 2005.
25. Boud D. Sustainable assessment. **Assess Eval High Educ**. 2010;35(4):423–36.
26. Andrade HL. A critical review of research on student self-assessment. **Front Educ**. 2019;4:87.
27. Kearney S. Improving engagement in peer assessment. **Assess Eval High Educ**. 2013;38(7):875–91.
28. Schuwirth LWT, Ash J. Assessing tomorrow's learners. **Med Educ**. 2013;47(2):115–23.
29. Sims DA, Cilliers FJ. Programmatic assessment. **Adv Health Sci Educ**. 2023;28(4):1053–77.
30. Tabish SA. Assessment methods in medical education. **Int J Health Sci**. 2008;2(2):3–7.
31. Shrivastava SR, Shrivastava PS. Assessment reforms in medical education. **Curr Med Issues**. 2022;20(1):44–7.
32. Lakhtakia R, Wills S, Kanchan T. Technology-enhanced assessment. **JMIR Med Educ**. 2022;8(3):e35820.
33. Cook DA, Lineberry M, Pusic M, et al. Technology-enhanced assessment. **Med Educ**. 2018;52(11):1086–97.
34. Shrivastava SR, Shrivastava PS. Assessment reforms in medical education. **Curr Med Issues**. 2022;20(1):44–47.
35. Lakhtakia R, Wills S, Kanchan T, et al. Technology-enhanced assessment in medical education. **JMIR Med Educ**. 2022;8(3):e35820.
36. Cook DA, Lineberry M, Pusic M, et al. Technology-enhanced assessment in health professions education. **Med Educ**. 2018;52(11):1086–1097.