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”1 to ARCH2 and ART3 – with common features with the teacher:
  - Asking the learner to self-assess their performance
  - Reinforcing what was done well
  - Confirming/correcting what needs to improve
  - Helping the learner identify next steps to improve

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 hours4 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

METHODS:
- Review Literature: Feedback & Self-Assessment
- Reframe Feedback Models = Literature
- Test Model in Faculty Development Sessions and Evaluate

RESULTS: LITERATURE

TENSION & RECOGNITION OF RECEIVING FEEDBACK5-6
- 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-ASSESSMENT7
- 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
  - SOCIOBIOLOGICAL 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…?)

INDIRECT NATURE OF FEEDBACK TO SUSTAIN LEARNER8
- Indirect nature of feedback
  - OPPORTUNITY SCALES: Allow learner “time” to change answer and affirm correct response (2-RND 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

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” → 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 “STATE” 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
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