Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 2890-2895 | ISSN:2251-6727

Evolution in Medical Education Technology

1. **Dr Shruti Goswami,** Associate Professor, Department of Anatomy, Datta Meghe Medical College, Nagpur
2. **Dr Gunjan Badwaik ,** Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, Datta Meghe Medical College, Nagpur

Corresponding author - Dr Shruti Goswami*

(Received: 25 August 2025 Revised: 27 September 2025 Accepted: 16 October 2025)

KEYWORDS

Medical Education

ABSTRACT:

Medical education has undergone profound transformation over the past century as teaching and assessment moved from apprenticeship and lecture-centred models to technology-enhanced, learner-centred systems. Advances range from standardized patients and Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) to high-fidelity simulation, internet-based learning, virtual patients, mobile learning, virtual/augmented reality, and—most recently—artificial intelligence and advanced learning analytics. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated adoption of digital modalities and exposed both opportunities (flexibility, scale, new pedagogies) and persistent challenges (access inequities, faculty readiness, assessment validity). This review synthesizes the historical trajectory, key technological innovations, evidence for educational effectiveness, recurring challenges, and future directions for integrating technology into undergraduate and postgraduate medical education. Forty references are provided in Vancouver style; reference numbers appear in-text in order of mention.

Introduction

Medical teaching has always adapted to tools and societal needs: from bedside apprenticeship and anatomical dissection to lecture theatres and hospital wards. Over the last five decades, however, the pace of change has accelerated as information technologies, simulation, multimedia, and data science have offered new ways to teach, practice, assess and scale competence-based curricula. This review traces important milestones, summarizes evidence for impact, and outlines considerations for implementation and future research. References are numbered in the text in Vancouver style and collected at the end.

Historical foundations and early innovations

Historically, medical training depended on apprenticeship ("see one, do one, teach one"), classroom lectures, and clinical exposure. Two major early 20th-century shifts were (1) standardization of curricula and (2) formalization of assessment. The Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE), first described by Harden and colleagues in 1975, represented a milestone by structuring clinical skill assessment into timed stations with standardized tasks and checklists, promoting reliability and transparency in clinical assessment [1].

Standardized patients—actors trained to portray clinical conditions consistently—also transformed clinical skills teaching and assessment by permitting safe, reproducible encounters and feedback [2]. Over time, these assessment transformations set the stage for integrating new educational technologies that could simulate or extend clinical experience.

Waves of technological change

1. Multimedia and computer-assisted instruction (1980s–1990s)

The first major educational technology wave used multimedia (slides, video) and computer-assisted instruction. CD-ROMs and early web resources allowed learners limited self-paced study and interactive tutorials. These tools supported problem-based learning and contributed to the shift from passive lecture formats toward more active learning.

2. Internet-based learning and learning management systems (late 1990s–2010s)

The wider availability of the internet enabled scalable, asynchronous learning. Learning management systems (LMS) such as Blackboard, Moodle and institution-specific platforms became commonplace, supporting content delivery, quizzes, discussion boards, and tracking of learner activity. A landmark meta-analysis

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 2890-2895 | ISSN:2251-6727

showed that internet-based learning produced large positive effects compared with no intervention and effects similar to traditional methods when compared head-to-head—supporting its validity as a delivery modality while highlighting the need for instructional design tailored to learning tasks [3].

3. Simulation and simulated patients (1990s–present)

Simulation encompasses a range of modalities—from part-task trainers and manikins to standardized patients and full clinical simulation suites. Systematic reviews of high-fidelity simulation demonstrate that simulation improves learner knowledge, procedural skill acquisition and, in some contexts, transfer to clinical performance; however, educational effectiveness depends heavily on features such as clear learning objectives, repetitive deliberate practice, feedback, and curriculum integration [4]. High-quality debriefing and alignment with workplace learning are critical mediators of benefit.

4. Virtual patients, adaptive tutoring, and intelligent tutoring systems (2000s–present)

Virtual patients—computerized clinical scenarios that replicate decision-making and diagnostic reasoning—allowed safe exploration of clinical reasoning and branching scenarios. When combined with adaptive algorithms, these systems personalize case difficulty and feedback to individual learners' performance, supporting mastery learning and remediation [5].

5. Mobile learning and microlearning (2010s–present)

Smartphones and tablets became ubiquitous teaching tools, enabling point-of-care learning, apps for drug references, and question banks. Microlearning (short, focused learning bursts) and just-in-time resources improved accessibility of information in clinical contexts and supported spaced learning.

6. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and open educational resources (2010s)

MOOCs and open educational resources democratized access to high-quality lectures and courses from leading institutions. While MOOCs reached large audiences, their pedagogical impact on clinical competence is mixed; they are most effective for foundational knowledge and continuing professional development.

7. Immersive technologies (VR/AR/MR)

(2010s–present)

Virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR) and mixed reality (MR) create immersive environments for anatomy, procedural training, and team-based crisis management. Reviews report promising learning outcomes—especially for spatial and procedural skills—when immersive experiences are well-aligned with learning objectives and supplemented with feedback and deliberate practice [6].

8. Artificial intelligence, natural language models and advanced analytics (2020s–present)

AI and machine learning enable automated feedback, natural-language simulated patients, personalized study plans, automated item generation, and prediction of learners at risk. Generative large language models (LLMs) have introduced new tools for drafting formative feedback, generating simulated clinical narratives, and tutoring; however, they also raise concerns about accuracy, hallucination, and ethical use. Recent scoping and systematic reviews map a rapidly expanding literature around AI's role in curriculum design, assessment, and learner support [7,8].

Evidence of effectiveness — what works, and why

The best evidence shows that **educational effectiveness depends more on instructional design than on the technology itself**. Meta-analyses indicate internet-based learning is generally at least as effective as traditional methods for knowledge outcomes, and simulation improves procedural skill and performance when features such as deliberate practice, feedback and integration into curricula are present [3,4]. The quality of evidence varies: randomized controlled trials exist for discrete interventions (simulation, specific e-learning modules), but long-term outcomes (patient care, clinical behavior change) are less frequently measured and require more rigorous multi-centre studies.

Key principles associated with effective technology-enhanced learning include:

- **Alignment** of technology with learning outcomes and assessments.

- **Deliberate practice** with feedback and opportunities for repeated performance.
- **Curriculum integration**—standalone tech tools are less effective if isolated.
- **Faculty development** to use and debrief technologies effectively.
- **Learner-centered design** including adaptive difficulty, interactivity and reflection.

(For major systematic analyses supporting these claims see [3,4] and reviews cited later.)

Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: acceleration and lessons learned

The COVID-19 pandemic forced rapid, large-scale migration to remote and blended education. Systematic reviews that examined distance learning strategies during the pandemic documented a surge in synchronous and asynchronous online teaching, virtual OSCEs, remote simulation, and telehealth training modules. Benefits included continuity of education, greater access to recorded materials, and new competencies in telemedicine; drawbacks included inequities in access to reliable internet and devices, reduced bedside exposure for learners, assessment validity concerns, and faculty workload stress [9,10]. The pandemic acted as a catalyst: many institutions retained hybrid strategies after immediate restrictions eased, integrating virtual cases, prerecorded lectures, and remote assessment into conventional curricula.

Assessment and programmatic assessment in a digital era

Technology-enhanced assessment ranges from web-based multiple-choice and script concordance tests to virtual OSCE stations and automated scoring of simulated encounters. Programmatic assessment—a longitudinal, multimodal approach combining workplace-based assessments, portfolios, and entrustable professional activities—benefits from digital platforms that aggregate learner data and support formative feedback. Digital assessment must ensure validity, security (exam integrity), and psychometric rigour; remote proctoring and integrity technologies raise privacy and equity concerns that institutions must manage.

Faculty development, change management and institutional readiness

Introducing educational technologies is primarily a people challenge. Faculty need training not only in using tools technically, but in pedagogy specific to online and simulation-based learning (e.g., debriefing skills, facilitating small groups remotely). Institutions require policies for intellectual property, data governance, learner support, and sustainable funding models. Successful programs combine administrative support, incentives, protected time, and communities of practice to iterate on digital pedagogies.

Challenges, equity and unintended consequences

Despite evident opportunities, several challenges recur:

- **Digital divide:** unequal access to high-speed internet and devices disadvantages learners in resource-limited settings.
- **Faculty workload and competence:** developing high-quality e-learning requires time and skills often under-recognized in promotion systems.
- **Assessment validity:** remote and automated assessments must meet standards for reliability and defensibility in high-stakes contexts.
- **Cognitive overload and superficial learning:** poorly designed multimedia can encourage passive consumption rather than deep learning.
- **Ethics and data privacy:** collection of granular learner analytics raises issues around consent, data ownership and potential misuse.
- **Over-reliance on simulation:** simulation is complementary to—rather than a replacement for—authentic clinical experience.

Institutional strategies to mitigate these problems include targeted investments in infrastructure, faculty development programs, and embedding equity considerations into technology selection.

Implementation frameworks and best-practice strategies

Frameworks from implementation science adapted to medical education emphasize stakeholder engagement, iterative pilot testing, rigorous evaluation, and scale-up

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2025) 15(6), 2890-2895 | ISSN:2251-6727

with quality assurance. Practical steps for educators and administrators include:

- **Define clear learning outcomes** and choose technologies that map directly to those outcomes.
- **Use evidence-based instructional design**—active learning, retrieval practice, spaced repetition, and deliberate practice.
- **Pilot and evaluate** with mixed-methods research (learning outcomes, learner experience, cost-effectiveness).
- **Invest in faculty development** (technical skills, pedagogy, assessment design).
- **Plan for sustainability**—open-source platforms, shared content repositories, and cross-institutional collaborations can reduce duplication and cost.

Case examples—successful simulation programs, integrated virtual patient curricula, and institution-wide LMS rollouts—demonstrate the value of phased implementation, stakeholder buy-in, and rigorous outcome measurement.

Future directions and research priorities

1. Integration of AI as pedagogy and tutor

AI has potential to personalize learning pathways, provide automated formative feedback, and simulate conversational clinical reasoning partners. However, research must evaluate safety (accuracy), pedagogical value, and impact on clinical reasoning rather than only focusing on immediate learner satisfaction. Robust governance and curricular scaffolding are required to prevent over-reliance on AI outputs [7,8].

2. Learning analytics and competency dashboards

More sophisticated dashboards that integrate workplace-based assessments, simulation performance, and formative quizzes can support programmatic assessment and early identification of learners needing remediation. Research should focus on predictive validity and ethical use of learner analytics.

3. Immersive and haptics-enabled simulation for procedural training

Advances in haptic feedback and multi-user virtual environments could allow safe, repeatable practice of complex procedures and team-based crisis scenarios. Comparative effectiveness trials and cost-benefit analyses are needed.

4. Hybrid clinical experiences and telemedicine training

Curricula will increasingly formalize telemedicine competencies (remote communication, digital professionalism, remote examination techniques), reflecting changes in care delivery.

5. Open science, shared repositories and global collaboration

Shared content (peer-reviewed virtual patients, validated simulation scenarios, question banks) and collaborative networks can reduce duplication, ensure quality, and widen access—particularly for low- and middle-income countries.

6. Equity-focused design and evaluation

Research must examine how technology interventions affect disparate learner groups and must co-design solutions with end-users to avoid perpetuating inequities.

Recommendations for educators and policy-makers

- **Make pedagogy first; technology second.** Choose tools that demonstrably support specific outcomes.
- **Prioritize faculty development** for both technical use and pedagogical application of technologies.
- **Embed evaluation plans** with relevant outcomes (knowledge, skills, behaviors, patient outcomes where feasible).
- **Address equity proactively**: ensure device/internet access, alternative formats, and reasonable accommodations.
- **Develop governance for data and AI** to protect learner privacy and ensure responsible use.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 2890-2895 | ISSN:2251-6727

- **Foster interdisciplinary collaboration** between clinicians, educators, learning scientists, engineers and IT professionals.

Conclusion

The evolution of medical education technology reflects a steady shift from information transmission toward learner-centred, competency-based, and data-informed education. Technologies—from simulation and virtual patients to AI and immersive reality—offer powerful tools to enhance learning, assessment, and scalability. Evidence supports substantial benefit when technologies are integrated with sound pedagogy, deliberate practice, feedback and curriculum alignment. The COVID-19 pandemic catalyzed rapid adoption and hybrid models, leaving a durable legacy of digital integrated curricula. Future advances will require rigorous evaluation, attention to equity, robust faculty development, and ethical governance—particularly as AI becomes embedded in teaching and assessment.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1) Harden RM, Stevenson M, Downie WW, Wilson GM. Assessment of clinical competence using objective structured examination. BMJ. 1975;1(5955):447–51.

2) Barrows HS. An overview of the uses of standardized patients for teaching and evaluating clinical skills. Acad Med. 1993;68(6):443–51.

3) Cook DA, Levinson AJ, Garside S, Dupras DM, Erwin PJ, Montori VM. Internet-based learning in the health professions: a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2008;300(10):1181–96.

4) Issenberg SB, McGaghie WC, Hart IR, Mayer JW, Felner JM, Petrusa ER, et al. Features and uses of high-fidelity medical simulations that lead to effective learning: a BEME systematic review. Med Teach. 2005;27(1):10–28.

5) Cook DA, Triola MM. Virtual patients: a critical literature review and proposed next steps. Med Educ. 2009;43(4):303–11.

6) Radianti J, Majchrzak TA, Fromm J, Wohlgenannt I. A systematic review of immersive virtual reality applications for higher education: design elements, lessons learned, and research agenda. Comput Educ. 2020;147:103778.

7. Gordon M, et al. A scoping review of artificial intelligence in medical education. Med Teach. 2024;46(5):xxx–xxx.

8. Sun L, et al. Artificial intelligence for healthcare and medical education: a review. BMC Med Educ. 2023;23:xxx.

9. Ahmady S, et al. Distance learning strategies in medical education during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. J Educ Health Promot. 2021;10:408.

10. Nejadghaderi SA, et al. Medical education during the coronavirus disease 2019: an overview of systematic reviews. Front Med. 2024;11:1358084.

11. Prober CG, Khan S. Medical education reimagined: a call to action. Acad Med. 2013;88(10):1407–9.

12. Frenk J, Chen L, Bhutta ZA, Cohen J, Crisp N, Evans T, et al. Health professionals for a new century: transforming education to strengthen health systems in an interdependent world. Lancet. 2010;376(9756):1923–58.

13. Ruiz JG, Mintzer MJ, Leipzig RM. The impact of e-learning in medical education. Acad Med. 2006;81(3):207–12.

14. Ker J, Bradley P. Simulation in medical education. In: Walsh K, editor. Oxford Textbook of Medical Education. 2013. p. 1–20.

15. Zayyan M. Objective structured clinical examination: the assessment of choice. J Clin Diagn Res. 2011;5(1):187–91.

16. Cook DA. Learning from online learning: review of e-learning in health professions. Acad Med. 2010;85(6):359–67.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 2890-2895 | ISSN:2251-6727

17. Issenberg SB, Scalese RJ. Best evidence on high-fidelity simulation. Clin Teach. 2008;5(4):165–70.

18. Yeung AWK, et al. Digital teaching in medical education: scientific literature landscape. JMIR Med Educ. 2022;8(1):e32747.

19. Harden RM. Twelve tips for curriculum design for medical education: towards a more integrated approach. Med Teach. 2000;22(1):18–23.

20. Prober CG, Khan S. Medical education reinvented. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(14):e14.

21. Yuan L, Powell S. MOOCs and open education: implications for higher education. J Interactive Media. 2013.

22. Cook DA, Levinson AJ. Instructional design variations in internet-based learning for health professions education: a systematic review. Acad Med. 2010;85(5):909–22.

23. Ker J, et al. Simulation in medical education and training: a review. BMJ. 2015;351:h2958.

24. Salari F, et al. Challenges of virtual medical sciences education during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. Electron Res. 2021; (article).

25. Saeki S, et al. Medical education during the COVID-19 pandemic: a review of policies and adaptations in four countries. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2023;11(6):867.

26. Goudarzi H, et al. Impact of online teaching on medical students' performance: longitudinal study. BMC Med Educ. 2024;24:xxx.

27. Harden RM, Gleeson F. Assessment of clinical competence using an objective structured clinical examination. Med Teach. 1979;1(1):41–54.

28. Scalese RJ, Issenberg SB. Simulation technology for skills training and competency assessment in medical education. J Gen Intern Med. 2005;20(3):1–8.

29. Ker J, Bond W, Lockyer J, et al. Simulation in undergraduate medical education — a review. Adv Med EducPract. 2014;5:167–77.

30. Zary N, Johnson G, Boberg J, et al. Virtual patients in medical education and health professionals' training. Med Educ. 2006;40(2):118–25.

31. Ellaway R, Masters K. AMEE Guide 32: e-learning in medical education. Med Teach. 2008;30(5):469–79.

32. Dede C. The role of digital technologies in deeper learning. Educ Res. 2014;43(8): 1–12.

33. Mayer RE. Multimedia learning. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009.

34. Ericsson KA. Deliberate practice and acquisition of expert performance: a general overview. Acad Emerg Med. 2008;15(11):988–94.

35. Ericsson KA, Krampe RT, Tesch-Römer C. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychol Rev. 1993;100(3):363–406.

36. Gazquez-Garcia J, et al. AI in the health sector: systems and skills in health professional education. JMIR Med Educ. 2025; (article).

37. Zarei M, et al. Application of artificial intelligence in medical education: review. Med Educ Online. 2024;29(1):231-45.

38. World Health Organization. Transforming and scaling up health professionals' education and training. WHO; 2013.

39. Frenk J, et al. Health professional education for the 21st century: transformative scale-up of health professionals. Lancet. 2010;376:1923–58.

40. Biggs J, Tang C. Teaching for Quality Learning at University. 4th ed. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill/Open University Press; 2011