

## Development of an Effective Tool to Evaluate Grand Rounds

Charles Boucek, MD  
Rita M. Patel, MD  
James Walker, BS

Department of Anesthesiology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Grand Rounds (GR) providing CME to large audiences are predominantly lecture based.<sup>1</sup> Attendance has been correlated with pass rates of the ABA written exam<sup>2</sup> but evaluation of GR quality has been difficult<sup>3</sup>. Presentation variables that have been identified<sup>4</sup> include: the speaker; lecture hall; structure/clarity of the lecture; humor; timing; illustrations; and delivery. We developed a new tool that would identify unmet needs, document academic merit, fulfill CME certification requirements, and provide feedback to the speaker. The first 12 speakers received 181 responses.

	C	H	A	R	L	I	E
# of Responses	181	180	180	172	179	181	179
Mean	7.99	7.80	7.97	8.15	8.03	7.80	7.71

# of Presenters Evaluated	12
---------------------------	----

Median	8	8	8	9	8	8	8
Mode	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

The high values for median and mode convey audience satisfaction. The marginally lowest score (E), measured impact on work practices. Use of a Likert scale permitted comparisons using measurable criteria. Limiting the form to a single page and including a whimsical mnemonic helped make it user-friendly. Comments provided insight into aspects not easily quantified including suggestions for future speakers and topics.

<sup>1</sup> Herbert RS, Wright SM. Re-examining the Value of Medical Grand Rounds. *Academic Medicine* 2003;78: 1248-52

<sup>2</sup> Landers DF, Becker GL, Newland MC, Peters KR. Lecture Practices in United States Anesthesiology Residencies. *Anesth Analg* 1992;74:112-5

<sup>3</sup> Greenhalgh T, Toon P, Russell J, Wong G Plumb L, Macfarlan F. Transferability of principles of evidence based medicine to improve educational quality: systemic review and case study of an online course in primary health care. *BMJ* 2003;326(7381):142-145

<sup>4</sup> Hart N, Waugh G, Waugh R. The Role of the Lecture in University Teaching. Teaching and Educational Development Institute, University of Queensland 2002 ([http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/conferences/teach\\_conference00/papers/hart-waugh-et-al.html](http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/conferences/teach_conference00/papers/hart-waugh-et-al.html))

Department of Anesthesiology Grand Rounds 2005-2006

CME Evaluation Form

(Course number 142, Center for Continuing Education in the Health Sciences)

---

Lecture Date:

Title:

Presenter:

Directions:

(Please indicate your response using the scale below:)

X = Not appropriate      1 = poor      9 = outstanding

*The Presenter:*

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. <i>Communicated</i> clearly with words and/or visual aids                                    | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |   |
| 2. <i>Helped</i> make difficult concepts understandable   |   | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3. <i>Achieved</i> stated goals or objectives   | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |   |
| 4. <i>Responded</i> to questions in a helpful manner  | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |   |
| 5. <i>Led</i> the audience to new understanding with unbiased, scientifically rigorous material |   | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 6. <i>Increased</i> my interest in the subject  | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |   |
| 7. <i>Enhanced</i> my ability to work within the clinical, research or academic environment.    |   | X | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Comments: