



Evaluation of medical education virtual program: P3 model

RITA REZAEI¹, NASRIN SHOKRPOUR^{2*}, MARYAM BOROUMAND³

¹Quality Improvement in Clinical Education Research Center, Education Development Center, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran; ²English Department, Faculty of Para Medical Sciences, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran; ³Student Research Committee, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

Abstract

Introduction: In e-learning, people get involved in a process and create the content (product) and make it available for virtual learners. The present study was carried out in order to evaluate the first virtual master program in medical education at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences according to P3 Model.

Methods: This is an evaluation research study with post single group design used to determine how effective this program was. All students 60 who participated more than one year in this virtual program and 21 experts including teachers and directors participated in this evaluation project. Based on the P3 e-learning model, an evaluation tool with 5-point Likert rating scale was designed and applied to collect the descriptive data.

Results: Students reported storyboard and course design as the most desirable element of learning environment (2.30 ± 0.76), but they declared technical support as the less desirable part (1.17 ± 1.23).

Conclusion: Presence of such framework in this regard and using it within the format of appropriate tools for evaluation of e-learning in universities and higher education institutes, which present e-learning curricula in the country, may contribute to implementation of the present and future e-learning curricula efficiently and guarantee its implementation in an appropriate way.

Keywords: Elearning; Evaluation; Education

*Corresponding author:

Nasrin Shokrpour,
Faculty of Para Medical
Sciences, Shiraz University of
Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran
Tel: +98 71 3228911
Email: shokrpourn@gmail.
com

Please cite this paper as:

Rezaei R, Shokrpour N,
Boroumand M. Evaluation
of medical education
virtual program: P3 model.
J Adv Med Educ Prof.
2016;4(4):202-205.

Received: 6 February 2016

Accepted: 16 July 2016

Introduction

Garrison views e-learning as online learning facility through network technologies. Elearning has been formed in a knowledge-based community and is the product of fast and expanding developments of modern technologies (1-5).

Elearning possesses special components including ease and speed of updating, storage, retrieval, distribution, and sharing with network-based data, conducting learning process and live communication with the learners via computer and by means of internet standard technology, focus on comprehensive paradigm in learning, educational flexibility and learning, learning redundancy capability and learner-centered learning (6).

Actually, reduction in educational costs is deemed as one of the reasons, which have caused e-learning to be highly noticed today (7).

While developing e-learning products and preparation of opportunities for e-learning has been posited as one of the fields of higher education that is increasingly expanded, our knowledge and awareness about the effectiveness of these new attitudes about learning are restricted because of the shortage of valid scientific evaluations (2).

Anyway, some studies have been so far conducted about evaluation of e-learning, in each of which certain goals and perspectives have been addressed.

In a study conducted to examine and explain a framework for qualitative guarantee of e-learning

all over Taiwan, the attitude of participants in virtual educational program was investigated. In this survey, two types of educational programs were explored including E-Learning Service Certification (E-LSE) and E-Learning Courseware Certification (E-LCC). The analysis signified that the quality of the framework had adequate validity and authenticity and it showed that the participants in both E-LSE and E-LCC curricula felt satisfied with their educational program. The behavioral analysis indicated that in E-LCC method, the positive and growing attitudes were only directed toward improving the acceptance of E-LSC among the participants; also, in E-LCC, positive orientations referred to further preferences and adaptability to improve and facilitate the acceptance and agreeableness of E-LCC (8-11).

The multiplicity of effective factors, variables and diverse classifications, which have been implemented from several perspectives, is one of the paramount challenges in evaluation of e-learning. To assess an e-learning setting, it necessitates identifying the main and effective key factors in implementation of electronic programs successfully including the elements. In this regard, the main success factors may be due to activities and elements which should be confirmed in order to ensure the successful implementation of curricula (2).

Khan's P3 (People, Process and Product) model assumes several factors as effective in creation of an appropriate e-learning environment. The presented continuum in this model includes eight dimensions as follows: institutional, pedagogical, technological, interface design, management, evaluation, resource support and ethical.

The present study was designed to evaluate the virtual course of medical education in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences based on Khan's P3 e-learning model to answer the quality of different elements of the course in students and directors' perspective.

Methods

This evaluation research study with post single group was designed to determine the effectiveness of a virtual program in master degree at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (SUMS). All students (60) who had participated in this virtual program in more than one year and 21 experts including teachers and directors participated in this evaluation project. According to P3 e-learning model, an evaluation tool (questionnaire) with 5-point Likert rating scale (from 0 "never" to 4 "perfectly exists") was designed and applied to collect the data. The questionnaire covered 8 dimensions of the model.

Content validity of the questionnaire was checked by 3 professors in e-learning and its total reliability ($r=0.92$) was confirmed.

Internal consistency of the eight dimensions was measured through Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 1)

The final questionnaire was emailed to all 110 students who had participated in the virtual education for more than one year; all students 60 filled out the form and returned the email.

The researchers asked all 21 directors and teachers who were involved in the program to fill out the questionnaire and they accepted.

Results

The students' perspectives on different dimensions and criteria of the virtual course are shown in Table 2.

Teachers' perspectives on different dimensions and criteria of the virtual course are shown in Table 3.

Discussion

Based on the findings from the students, resource support of the virtual program was in inappropriate condition in both online and offline sources (with means of 0.73 and 0.77). Similarly, it can be inferred from the results that e-learning in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences is not

Table 1: Alpha coefficient in eight dimensions of the questionnaire

Dimensions	Alpha coefficient	95% confidence interval of the difference	
		Lower	Upper
Institutional	0.97	0.75	0.99
Management	0.87		
Technological	0.95		
Pedagogical	0.87		
Interface design	0.97		
Resource support	0.97		
Evaluation	0.98		
Ethical	0.78		
Total	0.92		

Table 2: Students' perspective on e-learning dimensions

Dimension	Criterion	Mean±SD
Institutional and management	Administrative affairs	1.74±1.52
	Educational affairs	
	Service affairs	
	Delivery and content management	
Technological	Infrastructure	1.51±1.17
	Hardware	
	Software	
Pedagogical	Content	2.05±1.13
	Goal	
	Media	
	Design	
	Organizing	
Interface design	Learning strategies	2.30±1.90
	Design of page & site	
	Content design	
	Guidance	
	Accessibility	
Resource support	Ease of usability	1.17±1.17
	Online support	
	Online sources	
Evaluation	Offline sources	1.80±1.11
	Curriculum evaluation	
	Learners assessment	
Ethical	Diversity of learners	2.02±1.25
	Legal affairs	

Table 3: Teachers and directors' perspectives on elearning dimensions

Dimension	Criterion	Mean±SD
Institutional	Administrative affairs	2.36±0.66
	Educational affairs	
Management	Content production management	2.57±0.83
	Content presentation management	
Technological	Infrastructure	3.09±0.81
	Hardware	
	Software	
Pedagogical	Goal	2.77±0.70
	Media	
	Design	
	Organizing	
	Learning strategies	
Interface design	Evaluation of learners	2.46±0.84
	Content design	
	Guidance	
Ethical	Accessibility	2.18±0.98
	Disciplines and regulations	
	Legal affairs	

at a favorable level in all dimensions.

According to the teachers and directors' views, technological domain with mean 3.18, especially in hardware and software criterion was in a better condition than other domains. However, this superiority is also relatively shown in subordinated parts of other domains as well

(including accessibility and guidance in interface design). Generally, they evaluated this virtual course at an average level. The best condition was related to technological dimension while the worst status was related to the ethical dimension (12). The results revealed that elearning in SUMS is far from the favorable status.

Conclusion

The best advantages of applying Khan's P3 model was related to its comprehensiveness that includes all effective cornerstones in e-learning system and also the other one is that Khan's continuum was based on features and requirements of learning environment. Thus, presence of such framework in this regard and using it within the format of appropriate tools for evaluation of e-learning in universities and higher education institutes, which present e-learning curricula in the country, may contribute to implementation of the present and future e-learning curricula efficiently and guarantee its implementation in an appropriate way.

Conflict of Interest: None declared.

References

1. Karimzadegan Moghadam D. E-learning. Tehran: Payam-E-Noor University (PNU); 2006. Persian.
2. Asgarpoor S, Abedi A, Honarvar Sh., editor. Role of E-learning in developing of learning trend. Proceeding of the 2nd conference on E-learning, 2008 Feb 2-4; Tehran. Tehran: Iran; 2004. p. 229. Persian.
3. Karimzadegan Moghadam D. Learning for tomorrow: Role of distance education. Tehran: Payam-E-Noor University (PNU); 2006. Persian.
4. Golzari Z, Kiamanesh A, Ghoorchian N. Codification, validation and evaluation of internal quality of E-learning in national higher education system. Quarterly of Higher Education Curricula Studies. 2010; 1(1): 158-60. Persian.
5. Zarei Zavaraki I, Safaee Movahed S. E-learning in the 21st century. Tehran: Payam-E-Noor Pub; 2004. Persian.
6. Ruiz JG, Candler C, Teasdale TA. Peer reviewing e-learning: Opportunities, challenges, and solutions. Acad Med. 2007; 82:503-7.
7. Shon JG. Standardization for e-learning. Department of computer science, Korea national open university. 2002; 12:32.
8. Anarinejad A, Saket P, Safavi A. Design of the conceptual framework for evaluation of E-learning curricula in higher education institutes. Scientific Research Journal of Educational Technology. 2010. 4(3): 41. Persian.
9. Rabiee M, Mohebi A, Hajji Khajehloo S, Saleh R. Evaluation of internal quality in curriculum of virtual learning courses at Mashhad University of Firdausi. Journal of Development Horizon in Medical Education. 2010; 4(1): 8.
10. Ghaedi B, Asgari MA, Attaran M. Evaluation of virtual learning curriculum in the field of computer engineering (IT major) from the viewpoint of academic teachers and students at Iran University of Sciences & Technology (IUST) Tehran branch. 2nd National Conference on E-learning. 2006 Jan 23; Tehran. Tehran: Iran. 2006. Available from: www.civilica.com. Persian.
11. Chen M. An Evaluation of the ELNP e-learning quality: Assurance program perspectives of Gap Analysis and Innovation Diffusion. Educational Technology Society. 2009; 12(1): 18-33.
12. Khan BH. The people-process-product continuum in E-learning: the E-learning P3 model. Educational Technology. 2004; 44(5): 33-40.