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INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Current Approaches to Giving Learners Feedback

- Feedback (FB) is an essential element in supporting the growth and entrenchment of learners to care for patients
- Numerous FB models abound – from the “Feedback Sandwich” to ARCH

Methods

- Recent study on teaching pre-post duty hours revealed that feedback remains amongst the lowest rated item on any educational attestation
- Numerous FB models abound – from the “Feedback Sandwich” to ARCH

Problem: Feedback Provided/Received

- Feedback remains amongst the lowest rated item on any educational evaluation independent of trainee level or specialty independent of FB model teachers apply, the FB workshops attended, and/or teacher attestations that they give FB
- Recent study on teaching pre-post duty hours revealed that
  - Faculty have less time to provide feedback
  - Residents request more feedback

Objective: To re-define 1st step in FB process informed by recent evidence on factors influencing trainee perceptions of FB & accuracy of learner self-assessment

RESULTS: LITERATURE

Tension & Recognition of Receiving Feedback

- Interpretation and uptake of feedback is influenced by trainee’s:
  - Confidence, experience, fear of not appearing knowledgeable
  - Receiving FB is difficult and often doesn’t register with trainees as it strikes at the tension between core trainee needs:
    - Desire to learn/grow to be competent physicians
    - Need to be accepted for who they are
    - Obtaining an optimal final grade
  - Example highlighting this tension
    - When teachers open a FB interaction by “asking” learners “How did it go?”
    - Learners want to appear competent – but know they need to learn = “Pretty well…. need a few more details on frequency of falls…."

Self-Assessment?

- Humans are poor at producing self-generated summative assessments of their own performance or ability
- Why?: Generating “accurate” summative self-assessments of one’s own level of performance or ability is particularly challenging due to:
  - Cognitive Reasons: Information neglect and memory biases
  - Sociobehavioral Reasons: It is adaptive to maintain an optimistic outlook
  - Social Reasons: Not always receiving adequate feedback from peers and supervisors
  - Difficulty of self-assessment increases when the “ask” is vague (How do you think it went….?)

RESULTS: STARCH FEEDBACK MODEL

1st State Focus of the Feedback

- Literature review highlighted the need to reform feedback model to support:
  - Clarity of “ask” – making the focus on the self-assessment explicit
  - Direct – unambiguous, recognizable feedback

- Explicit discussion of trainee and teacher tensions/needs

- Updated the standard ARCH FB model to include “ate” to STARCH

- Teacher begins by STating the FB focus (e.g., Hx omits key fall risk elements; Dif Dx for dementia)

- Next teacher proceeds with the Ask – to self-assess strengths/weaknesses relative to that focus, Reinforce, Correct, Help steps in ARCH

Test Model in Faculty Development Workshops

- FB workshops have been updated to reflect STARCH with deliberate practice:
  - How to orient learners by reviewing purpose of FB [to promote learner’s growth] and teacher’s role in STating FB focus prior to learner self-assessment
  - Teachers then practice STating an identified FB focus to simulated learners

Results

- FB Workshop Ratings: Mean 3.7-4.0 (1=least favorable to 4=most favorable)
- Learners’ Ratings On Item “teacher provided helpful and timely FB” increased significantly (.40; 5-point scale) 6 months pre/post workshops
- Learners and Faculty Report being “relieved” that the “what I am thinking” game is replaced by providing specific FB to promote learner growth

Discussion & Future Work

- Adding “Stating” to begin the FB interaction is an evidence-based addition to established FB models that is valued by teachers and learners

- Next Steps: Expand model use, develop on-line training materials and infographics, and evaluate its impact using Kirkpatrick levels

INDIRECT NATURE OF FEEDBACK TO SUSTAIN LEARNER

- Indirect nature of feedback
  - Opportunity Spaces: Allow learner “time” to change answer and affirm correct response (2nd chance)
  - Provide Clues in Follow-Up Questions: Reframe and ask more specific questions to lead learner to “answer”
  - Reframe the Question so that the wrong answer becomes correct
  - Treat Wrong Answers as Possible, but in need for further consideration
  - Approach preserves learners self-confidence and esteem and preceptor’s relationship with the learner
  - Learners do not perceive they have received feedback as they “discovered” the answers
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