

MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION MEETING
ASSOCIATION OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT PROGRAMS
June 5-6, 1973

cc: Ester
Harlan
Boccha

ATTENDEES: Suzanne Greenberg, Northeastern University
Reginald Carter, Duke University
John Hoey, John Hopkins University
Donald Bosshart, University of Texas, Medical Branch, Galveston
Donald Fisher, University of Mississippi
Len Heller, Baylor College
Michael McCally, George Washington University
David Glazer, Emory University

The evaluation committee meeting convened at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 5, 1973 at Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia.

The committee was charged with the responsibility of making recommendations to the Association of Physician Assistant Programs (APAP) Executive Committee concerning PA evaluation, both in regard to evaluation to be generated by the APAP and to screen proposals to use program data by persons outside the association.

Members briefly summarized present and/or proposed PA evaluation efforts currently existing within their respective programs:

1. David Glazer discussed the proposed, and partially implemented, Emory evaluation program which is separated into three levels of investigation. Emory intends to determine how well students are trained, how they are utilized in conjunction with training, what performance (both academic and clinical) predictors are valid for selection purposes, and what some of the effects of PA employment are on the Georgia health delivery system.
2. Don Bosshart discussed the evaluation emphasis at the University of Texas, Galveston. He described a series of PA educational objectives (including the PA as a teacher) and described methods of determining whether those objectives have been met. Emphasis has been on development of oral examinations which are to be implemented this summer. He also described student feedback devices.
3. The Duke evaluations were described by Reggie Carter. He discussed the history of the Duke effort including some of the N.C. physician

- survey information, task analysis efforts, psychometric predictor components, utilization and motivation studies, and curricula evolution
4. Sue Green berg highlighted some of the evaluation efforts performed by A.D. Little under North eastern's management. Much useful work has been generated concerning attitudes and expectation/realization of PA's patients, employers, etc , with the committee's opinion that any additional such studies should be duplicative

A summary of these presentations resulted in the delineation of five legitimate areas of concern for evaluation:

1. Felt need for PA's
2. Student Selection
3. Specific training program evaluation
4. Studies of Impact on Delivery systems.
5. Maintenance of statistical data on graduates

The remainder of the meeting was addressed to these five areas

- 1 Felt needs - The committee determined that it is necessary to develop a survey of physicians including such data as: society membership, geographical location, community description, type and size of practice, PA hiring potential, etc These data will be useful in determining the potential PA job market as well as for eventual placement information for PA's

A semi-annual bulletin with periodic up-date inserts was suggested Reggie Carter will coordinate with other associations, determine the necessary parameters, and develop a survey format by August 1, 1973 to be reviewed by remaining committee members. The survey and recommendations for implementation will then be submitted to the Executive Board. One expected recommendation is the development of useful placement data by January, 1974

2. Student selection - It was noted that the Executive Board formed a similar committee to advise to re student selection, so the evaluation committee need not consider the broad spectrum of selection. Nonetheless, feedback from evaluations are essential for developing selection criteria and procedures.
- Len Heller presented the Baylor College proposal to investigate and validate various selection devices and techniques. Emphasized in the proposal is the study of devices in relationship not only to didactic performance, but also to clinical and, eventually, job performance. The committee decided to make no formal recommendations concerning selection/evaluation, but, since three members are also on the selection committee, necessary liaison will be maintained.
3. Specific training program evaluation - The committee agreed that it should consider only PA "national" implications, and that each program would no doubt wish to conduct their own evaluations of individual students, graduates, curricula and programs.
4. Studies of impact on delivery systems. It was agreed that this area is the most difficult to attack. Some time was devoted to discussing what the APAP role should be in such studies. It was determined that APAP should not try to conduct or fund such studies. Rather, APAP should develop a study model which assures collection of comparable data by various programs, and should establish a proposal review board to assure that useful studies are conducted by competent investigators.
- Briefly, Michael McCally and Len Heller will develop a series of recommendations to the Executive Board which will include the following:
- Step 1: Inventory of programs to determine what studies have been done, what is being done, what is proposed, and what is desirable.
- Step 2: An ad hoc committee will be formed to prepare a proposal for funding (\$20,000 to \$50,000 range) an APAP study to:

- a. determine impact evaluation goals/parameters
- b. write protocol
- c. support travel
- d. provide consultants

Step 3: Develop a model for rationale and techniques for national study of the impact of PA's on health care and delivery.

Their submittal will be reviewed by committee members in early July and final recommendations will be available to the Executive Board prior to the next meeting.

5. PA graduate statistics. The committee felt it desirable to collect and maintain a data file on PA graduates in order to develop mobility indices. Is PA employment stable, are PA's providing services where they are most needed, do they desire employment where the potential job market lies, what are some of the factors affecting mobility, what are PA's salary scales? There are some of the questions a data file would help answer. In addition to mobility studies, such a file would serve as a valuable centralized source for PA graduates. Don Bosshart and Sue Greenberg will determine parameters, format, and procedures for developing and maintaining the data file. This protocol will be reviewed by committee members and submitted to the Executive Committee by the next meeting.

Related to this, David Glazer and Don Fisher will develop guidelines for the disseminating requested data and reviewing proposal requests that are routinely received by various programs and APAP.

Guidelines will be established for use once the PA data base and potential job market lists are operational. The guidelines will address such items as types of data available/bonafide users, codification of PA and physician data, placement service operation etc. There will be

coordination with other professional societies. Guidelines will also be developed for the interim preceding centralized data collection/storage/dissemination.

Final recommendations will be provided to members by August 1, 1973 and available to the Executive Board before the next meeting

The committee discussed the problem of funding for meeting attendance. It was decided to solicit financial support from the Executive Board. Should another meeting of the evaluation committee be required, a tentative date was set for early September. Don Fisher agreed to host the meeting in New Orleans.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne B. Greenberg

David L. Glazer