Purpose
To evaluate common anatomy teaching tools from both student and instructor/institution perspectives. Evaluation criteria includes the Course Requirements and Learning Objectives.

Methods
1. Literature review
2. Anecdotal data from faculty, students, and vendors

Each tool was evaluated on a 3 point scale using the following criteria (compared to a living human):

Accuracy
Does the tool accurately represent human anatomy including macro, micro, and 3D structures as well as the position of a structure within a broader context?

Cost
What is the return on investment after factoring in acquisition, operation, and maintenance costs, preparation time, and ethical considerations?

Usability / Ease of Use
How easy/fast is the tool to set up, to navigate and manipulate, and to customize to specific teaching and learning styles and environments? Also, how reliable and accessible is the tool?

Conclusions
1. Attend to Evaluation Criteria (Table 1), Course (Table 2), and Learning Outcomes when selecting a tool. Consider using multiple tools within a course.
2. Successful implementation of MR requires a team-based approach including expertise in the subject taught, instructional design, IT, & acquisitions.
3. Caveat: Reliability of between-group comparisons was negatively impacted by within-group variance.

Suggested Tools for Common Anatomy Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teaching Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Anatomy &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>Static Images, MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Pre-Health &amp; Pre-Med</td>
<td>All (Specimens &amp; MR preferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Art, IT, Other</td>
<td>Specimens, MR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>