SAAP Journal of Integrative Physiology

https://www.thesaap.org/saap-journal

ISSN 3121-410X (Online)

PERSPECTIVE | SJIP 2026

OSPE and OSCE: Why It's Time We Take Practical Assessment Seriously

Utpal Kumar Datta*

Department of Physiology, Manipal Hospitals, Kolkata, India

Abstract

Written examinations have long dominated assessment in medical and health sciences education, yet they measure what students know rather than what they can do. The author argues for wider institutional adoption of Objective Structured Practical Examinations (OSPE) and Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE) as core components of competency assessment in health professions training. Both formats employ a station-based structure in which students rotate through multiple short tasks, each evaluated against a predetermined checklist of observable behaviors. OSCE focuses on clinical competencies such as history taking, physical examination, communication, and clinical reasoning, while OSPE targets practical laboratory and procedural skills. The perspective highlights four principal strengths. First, standardized checklists reduce examiner subjectivity and anchor evaluation to verifiable performance, offering fairer assessment than traditional *viva voce* or long-case formats. Second, the modular design samples a broad spectrum of competencies within a single examination, producing a more representative picture of clinical readiness. Third, these formats encourage deliberate practice of practical and communication skills, aligning preparation with the demands of clinical work. Fourth, the checklist structure enables precise, actionable feedback supporting both formative and summative purposes. Implementation challenges are acknowledged, including station design, recruitment and training of standardized patients, examiner calibration, logistical coordination, and demands on faculty time. These represent matters of institutional commitment rather than weaknesses in the model. The central question is not whether these methods are worth adopting, but whether institutions are prepared to make the organizational commitment that rigorous practical assessment requires.

Keywords: Assessment-learning alignment, clinical skills assessment, competency-based assessment, formative feedback, medical education, OSCE, OSPE, standardized checklists

1. Introduction

For decades, medical and health sciences education leaned heavily on written examinations as the primary yardstick for student performance. Theory papers, multiple-choice questions (MCQs), and long-answer formats have dominated assessment systems and while these tools certainly have their place, they share one fundamental blind spot i.e., they tell us very little about what a student can actually do.

Think about it. A candidate might write a perfectly detailed textbook answer on how to examine an abdomen and still be completely lost when standing in front of a real patient. They might describe the steps of taking a history with flawless accuracy on paper, yet struggle to have a natural, structured conversation with someone who is anxious and in pain. Knowing and doing are two very different things, and written examinations no matter how well designed, can only ever test one of them. This conceptual distinction is captured well in Miller's classic pyramid of clinical competence, which separates "knows" and "knows how" from the higher-order "shows how" and "does"[1].

It is precisely this gap that Objective Structured Practical Examinations (OSPE)[2] and Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE)[3] are designed to close. These two assessment formats have steadily gained ground across medical schools and health sciences institutions worldwide over the past few decades, and for good reason. They represent a genuine shift in how we think about competence moving the conversation from passive recall to active demonstration. The case for adopting them more widely is strong; and institutions that have not yet made them a core part of their assessment framework would do well to think carefully about why.

Address for correspondence:
Prof. Utpal Kumar Datta
Department of Physiology, Manipal Hospitals,
127, E.M. Bypass, Nitai Nagar, Mukundapur, Kolkata – 700099, India
E-mail: drutpaldatta@yahoo.com

How to cite this article: Datta UK. OSPE and OSCE: why it's time we take practical assessment seriously. SAAP J Integr Physiol. 2026;1(2): 23-26.

2. What is OSPE and OSCE and How do they Work?

At their core, both OSPE and OSCE follow the same structural logic. Students rotate through a series of stations, usually between 10 and 20, each designed to test a specific skill or competency within a defined, usually short, time limit. In OSCE, the focus is clinical. These include history taking, physical examination, patient communication, interpretation of investigations, and clinical decision-making[4]. In OSPE, the emphasis shifts toward practical laboratory or procedural skills. These include microscopy, specimen handling, instrument identification, technique demonstration, and the like[5].

What makes both formats distinctively different from traditional examinations is the use of standardized checklists at every station[6,7]. Each examiner or a faculty member assesses the student's performance against the same predetermined criteria. There is no ambiguity about what constitutes a satisfactory performance. The checklist defines it. The examiner observes it. The student either demonstrates it or doesn't.

This structure might sound straightforward, but the implications for fairness and consistency are significant. Two students sitting the same examination are assessed on identical tasks, using identical criteria, by examiners working from the same marking sheet. That level of standardization is almost impossible to achieve in conventional oral or *viva voce* examinations, where the direction of the conversation, the personality of the examiner, and even the time of day can subtly shape the outcome[8].

3. The Objectivity Argument - And Why it Matters More than We Admit

One of the most compelling arguments in favor of OSPE and OSCE is the issue of examiner bias. In traditional clinical assessments, the bedside *viva*, the long case and the practical examination, the subjectivity element was unavoidable. The same student performance can be interpreted very differently by different examiners[9]. A student who presents with confidence might be scored higher than one who has all the right answers but delivers them hesitantly. A student who is known to the examiner may be assessed consciously or through a slightly different lens than an unfamiliar face[10].

Checklists largely neutralize this. They do not eliminate human judgment entirely, but they anchor it firmly to observable behavior. The examiner is not asked to form a general impression of the student; they are asked to record whether specific, pre-listed actions were carried out correctly[11]. Did the student introduce themselves to the patient? Did they wash their hands before beginning the examination? Did they identify the correct anatomical landmark before proceeding? These are observable, verifiable behaviors, and their presence or absence can be recorded consistently across every student who passes through that station. This matters enormously. Students invest years of hard work into their training. They deserve to be assessed against a clear, consistent standard, not against the varying expectations of different examiners on different days. OSPE and OSCE, when well implemented, provide exactly that[12].

4. Testing what Actually Matters - Across the Full Range

Another major advantage of these formats is the sheer breadth of competencies they can cover within a single examination sitting. A well-designed OSCE might include 15 or 20 stations, each targeting something completely different[13]. One station might assess how a student takes a focused history. Another might test their ability to interpret an ECG. A third might evaluate how they communicate a difficult diagnosis to a distressed patient. A fourth might assess their practical skill in wound closure. A fifth might present an emergency scenario and observe how they prioritize and respond under pressure.

No conventional examination format can cover this kind of range in one sitting. A written paper can test knowledge but not skill. A *viva* can probe reasoning but is inherently limited in scope[14]. Structured station-based examinations allow institutions to sample across the full spectrum of practical and clinical competence systematically, making the overall picture of a student's ability far more representative and complete[15].

This breadth is not just logistically convenient; it reflects a more mature and accurate understanding of what clinical competence actually looks like[16]. A student who can diagnose brilliantly but cannot communicate with patients is not fully competent. A student with excellent technical skills but poor clinical reasoning is not ready for independent practice. OSPE and OSCE, thoughtfully designed, can assess all of these dimensions within a single examination.

5. Changing How Students Learn, Not Just How they are Tested

There is an often-overlooked pedagogical dimension to OSPE and OSCE that goes beyond their value as assessment tools. When students know they will be assessed on practical skills under observed conditions, they change how they prepare. They seek out opportunities to take histories from real patients. They rehearse clinical examinations until their technique is smooth and systematic. They work consciously on their communication, their procedural accuracy, their ability to remain composed under time pressure[17].

The assessment, in other words, drives learning in exactly the direction that clinical education should be going[18]. This is what educators refer to as assessment-learning alignment; when and what is assessed mirrors what the profession actually demands[19]. OSPE and OSCE are powerful instruments for achieving this alignment. They send a clear message to students that practical competence is not a secondary concern to be addressed after the theory examinations are done. It is central. It will be assessed rigorously. It matters.

Institutions that continue to rely primarily on written papers are, whether intentionally or not, sending the opposite message. They are suggesting that what matters most is what a student can recall and reproduce under examination conditions. The gap between that signal and the realities of clinical practice is one that graduates will eventually have to bridge on their own, often under circumstances that are far less forgiving than an examination hall[20].

6. An Honest Word on the Challenges

To tell the truth, if you ask any faculty member who has organized one of these examinations will admit honestly that OSPE and OSCE are not simple to run. The preparation involved is real, and it would be misleading to gloss over it.

Designing and implementing a good OSCE requires significant groundwork, often stretching over several months. Stations need to be carefully written, piloted, and reviewed for clarity and relevance. Standardized patients need to be recruited and trained to portray their role consistently across every student's attempt, which takes time and ongoing effort. Examiners need to be briefed and calibrated so that their interpretation of the checklist is aligned. Equipment needs to be sourced, set up, and checked before the examination begins. Physical space needs to be allocated and carefully arranged. For institutions with large student cohorts, running every student through twenty stations in a single day requires logistical coordination that can genuinely stretch departmental capacity[21].

There are also the matter of time demands on faculty. Writing good station material is a skill in itself, one that takes practice and genuine engagement with the clinical realities being tested[22]. Busy academics are not always able to give it the attention it deserves, and poorly written

stations, with ambiguous instructions or unrealistic time allocations, can undermine the quality of the entire examination. A badly run OSCE can be almost as inconsistent as the formats it was designed to replace.

None of this is a reason to avoid OSPE and OSCE. But it is a reason to invest in them properly rather than treating them as a box to be ticked. These examinations reward good planning and punish shortcuts. The institutional commitment has to be genuine, and it has to come from leadership as much as from individual faculty members[23].

7. The Feedback Advantage

One dimension of OSPE and OSCE that deserves more attention is their potential for delivering structured, meaningful feedback. Because every station has a checklist with specific observable criteria, the feedback that can be generated is far more precise and actionable than the general comments students often receive after conventional examinations. Rather than being told they need to 'improve their clinical skills' a phrase that means almost nothing in practice, a student can be told exactly which steps they missed, which aspects of their technique were unsatisfactory, and where their communication fell short[24].

When this feedback is delivered promptly and constructively, it becomes a genuine educational intervention, not merely a verdict[25]. Students can identify specific gaps in their practice and address them before the next assessment. The examination begins to serve a formative purpose alongside its summative one, a shift that most educators would agree is well worth pursuing[26].

8. The Bigger Picture

The adoption of OSPE and OSCE is, at a deeper level, a statement about what a medical or health sciences institution believes its core obligation to be. It reflects a conviction that producing competent practitioners not merely knowledgeable ones is the primary responsibility of professional education[27]. It signals to students, to faculty, and to the wider clinical community that practical skills are taken seriously and assessed rigorously.

The logistical demands are real but manageable. Many institutions across a wide range of settings and resource levels have demonstrated that OSPE and OSCE can be implemented successfully with thoughtful planning, institutional support, and a willingness to treat the preparation as worthwhile rather than burdensome[28,29]. The initial investment pays dividends in the form of graduates who are better prepared, more consistently assessed, and more confident in their practical abilities from the day they enter clinical practice.

OSPE and OSCE are not perfect examinations. Nothing is! They are demanding to organize, can be stressful for students, and depend on the quality of their design to deliver reliable results[30]. But these are implementation challenges, not fundamental flaws in the model. The core logic is sound i.e., assessment of students on what they can do, using standardized criteria, across a meaningful range of competencies. That logic is far more aligned with the demands of real clinical work than any written paper can hope to be[31].

9. Conclusion

The question for institutions that have not yet fully committed to these methods is not really whether OSPE and OSCE are worth the effort. The evidence, and the experience of institutions that have adopted them, suggests clearly that they are. The more honest question is whether we are willing to make the organizational commitment that serious practical assessment requires. Given what is at stake – the real-world competence of the practitioners we train and send out – the answer should not take long to arrive at.

Disclosure of AI Use

Minor assistance was taken from the AI tool, Claude (Sonnet 4.5).

References

1. Harden RM, Stevenson M, Downie WW, Wilson GM. Assessment of clinical competence using objective structured examination. Br Med J. 1975;1(5955):447-51. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.1.5955.447.
2. Harden RM, Cairncross RG. Assessment of practical skills: the objective structured practical examination (OSPE). Stud High Educ. 1980;5(2):187-96. DOI: 10.1080/03075078012331377216.
3. Harden RM, Gleeson FA. Assessment of clinical competence using an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE). Med Educ. 1979;13(1):41-54. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.1979.tb00918.x.
4. Khan KZ, Gaunt K, Ramachandran S, Pushkar P. The objective structured clinical examination (OSCE): AMEE Guide No. 81. Part II: organisation and administration. Med Teach. 2013;35(9):e1447-63. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2013.818635.
5. Malhotra SD, Shah KN, Patel VJ. Objective structured practical examination as a tool for the formative assessment of practical skills of undergraduate students in pharmacology. J Educ Health Promot. 2013;2:53. DOI: 10.4103/2277-9531.119040.
6. Lakum NR, Maru AM, Algotar CG, Makwana HH. Objective structured practical examination (OSPE) as a tool for the formative assessment of practical skills in the subject of physiology: a comparative cross-sectional analysis. Cureus. 2023;15(9):e46104. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46104.
7. Agarwal A, Batra B, Sood AK, Ramakantan R, Bhargava SK, Chidambaranathan N, et al. Objective structured clinical examination in radiology. Indian J Radiol Imaging. 2010;20(2):83-88. DOI: 10.4103/0971-3026.63040.
8. Abuzied AIH, Nabag WOM. Structured viva validity, reliability, and acceptability as an assessment tool in health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med Educ. 2023;23(1):531. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-023-04524-6.
9. McManus IC, Thompson M, Mollon J. Assessment of examiner leniency and stringency ('hawk-dove effect') in the MRCP (UK) clinical examination (PACES) using multi-facet Rasch modelling. BMC Med Educ. 2006;6:42. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6920-6-42.
10. Yeates P, O'Neill P, Mann K, Eva KW. Effect of exposure to good vs poor medical trainee performance on attending physician ratings of subsequent performances. JAMA. 2012;308(21):2226-32. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2012.36515.
11. Newble D. Techniques for measuring clinical competence: objective structured clinical examinations. Med Educ. 2004;38(2):199-203. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2004.01755.x.
12. Khan KZ, Ramachandran S, Gaunt K, Pushkar P. The objective structured clinical examination (OSCE): AMEE Guide No. 81. Part I: an historical and theoretical perspective. Med Teach. 2013;35(9):e1437-46. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2013.818634.
13. Harden RM. What is an OSCE? Med Teach. 1988;10(1):19-22. DOI: 10.3109/01421598809019321.
14. Wass V, van der Vleuten C, Shatzer J, Jones R. Assessment of clinical competence. Lancet. 2001;357(9260):945-9. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04221-5.
15. van der Vleuten CP. The assessment of professional competence: developments, research and practical implications. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 1996;1(1):41-67. DOI: 10.1007/BF00596229.

16. Miller GE. The assessment of clinical skills / competence / performance. Acad Med. 1990;65(9 Suppl):S63-7. DOI: 10.1097/00001888-199009000-00045.

17. Wormald BW, Schoeman S, Somasunderam A, Penn M. Assessment drives learning: an unavoidable truth? Anat Sci Educ. 2009;2(5):199-204. DOI: 10.1002/ase.102.

18. Newble DI, Jaeger K. The effect of assessments and examinations on the learning of medical students. Med Educ. 1983;17(3):165-71. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.1983.tb00657.x.

19. van der Vleuten CPM, Schuwirth LWT. Assessing professional competence: from methods to programmes. Med Educ. 2005;39(3):309-17. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02094.x.

20. Terry R, Hing W, Orr R, Milne N. Do coursework summative assessments predict clinical performance? A systematic review. BMC Med Educ. 2017;17(1):40. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-017-0878-3.

21. Patrício MF, Julião M, Fareleira F, Carneiro AV. Is the OSCE a feasible tool to assess competencies in undergraduate medical education? Med Teach. 2013;35(6):503-14. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2013.774330.

22. Pell G, Fuller R, Homer M, Roberts T; International Association for Medical Education. How to measure the quality of the OSCE: a review of metrics – AMEE Guide No. 49. Med Teach. 2010;32(10):802-11. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2010.507716.

23. Roberts C, Newble D, Jolly B, Reed M, Hampton K. Assuring the quality of high-stakes undergraduate assessments of clinical competence. Med Teach. 2006;28(6):535-43. DOI: 10.1080/01421590600711187.

24. Perron NJ, Louis-Simonet M, Cerutti B, Pfarrwaller E, Sommer J, Nendaz M. The quality of feedback during formative OSCEs depends on the tutors' profile. BMC Med Educ. 2016;16(1):293. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-016-0815-x.

25. Hodder RV, Rivington RN, Calcutt LE, Hart IR. The effectiveness of immediate feedback during the objective structured clinical examination. Med Educ. 1989;23(2):184-8. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.1989.tb00884.x.

26. Ouldali N, Le Roux E, Faye A, Leblanc C, Angoulvant F, Korb D et al. Early formative objective structured clinical examinations for students in the pre-clinical years of medical education: a non-randomized controlled prospective pilot study. PLoS One. 2023;18(12):e0294022. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0294022.

27. Epstein RM, Hundert EM. Defining and assessing professional competence. JAMA. 2002;287(2):226-35. DOI: 10.1001/jama.287.2.226.

28. Amor AB, Farhat H, Alinier G, Ounallah A, Bouallegue O. Evaluation of the implementation of the objective structured clinical examination in health sciences education from a low-income context in Tunisia: a cross-sectional study. Health Sci Rep. 2024;7(5):e2116. DOI: 10.1002/hsr2.2116.

29. Armijo-Rivera S, Fuenzalida-Muñoz B, Vicencio-Clarke S, Elbers-Arce A, Bozzo-Navarrete S, Kunakov N, et al. Advancing the assessment of clinical competence in Latin America: a scoping review of OSCE implementation and challenges in resource-limited settings. BMC Med Educ. 2025;25(1):587. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-025-07151-5.

30. Brannick MT, Erol-Korkmaz HT, Prewett M. A systematic review of the reliability of objective structured clinical examination scores. Med Educ. 2011;45(12):1181-9. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04075.x.

31. Norcini J, Anderson B, Bollela V, Burch V, Costa MJ, Duvivier R, et al. Criteria for good assessment: consensus statement and recommendations from the Ottawa 2010 Conference. Med Teach. 2011;33(3):206-14. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.551559.