

STUDENT FEEDBACK OF TEACHING SKILLS IN MEDICAL EDUCATION

Pawan K Mahato^{1*}, Amit Saxena², Kirandeep Kaur³

¹Tutor, ²Associate professor, ³Assistant Professor, Department of Anatomy, SGT Medical College, Budhera, Gurgaon, Haryana (INDIA).

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Feedback is an interactive process that should be based on observations made while working with a student in practice and may follow a period of reflection by the supervisor. Present study was undertaken to develop an evaluation system for undergraduate teaching, identify lacunae in teaching and encourage the teachers to overcome them.

Method: A questionnaire including 20 objective type questions was prepared on the basis of teaching skills. The teaching skills included were presentation skills, management of class (time and discipline management) and motivation for students that also includes student-teacher interaction. A total of 150 students of Ist year MBBS participated in the study. Two teaching sessions of each teacher were selected randomly.

Results: In the present study, the scores achieved by the Tutors (58.5%) were lower than assistant professors (74.9%) in all teaching skills studied. Average scores achieved by the all teachers in management skills (79.4%) show that it was effective for most of the teaching sessions. Scores achieved by all teachers for motivational skills show a lot of individual variation. This indicates that many teachers did not give due attention to it during teaching. **Conclusion:** Student feedback constitutes a major source of evidence for assessing teaching quality; that it can be used to inform attempts to improve teaching quality and that student feedback can be communicated in a way that is informative to future students. The present study can help to design a model evaluation system which, by using update data about teaching can play a key role in review, modifications, and hence evolution of the curriculum.

KEYWORDS: Evaluation of teaching, Feedback, Medical education.

INTRODUCTION

For improvement of quality of undergraduate teaching, it should be monitored and assessed regularly. Effective feedback has long been recognised as one of the main catalysts for effective learning.¹ Feedback is an interactive process which aims to provide learners with insight into their performance. When giving feedback information should include opinion and judgement about current performance and explore options for improved practice.²⁻³ Feedback should be based on observations made while working with a student in practice and may follow a period of reflection by the supervisor. This must be an unbiased, analytical reflection of what has occurred.⁴ Many teachers teach with very little concern about their own teaching skills. Teaching by them is almost a one-way process – from teacher to students. Thus they probably keep themselves away from the opportunity to identify weaker areas of their teaching skills and hence to overcome them.⁵

Importance of feedback in medical education has been emphasised for more than 20 years. Feedback has been studied and classified in the literature by delineating specific characteristics or schemes that should be included in order to provide the best opportunity for performance enhancement.⁶⁻¹² Teaching evaluation is a routine procedure in western countries for performance enhancement as well as learning, not so frequently practiced in India. Thus, the present study was undertaken to develop an evaluation system for undergraduate teaching, identify lacunae in teaching and encourage the teachers to overcome them.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in the Department of Anatomy, SGT Medical College, Budhera, Gurgaon, Haryana, India. First year MBBS students were taken as subjects. A questionnaire including 20 objective type questions was prepared on the basis of teaching skills. The teaching skills included were presentation skills, management of class (time and discipline management) and motivation for students that also includes student-teacher interaction. The options provided for each question with their scores was; YES (1), NO (0).

Firstly, the questionnaire was explained to the students and teachers and their queries were answered. Written consent to participate was taken from teachers as well as students. A total of 100 students of Ist year MBBS participated in the study. Three teaching sessions of each teacher were selected randomly. The assistant professors delivered lectures to a class of 100 students. For Tutors, students were divided into three units. Feedback was collected from all the students attending the class of tutors and assistant professors of department of Anatomy. The responses were collected as soon as the teacher left the class at the end of the lecture. Average score was calculated for both teaching sessions of each teacher. The scores achieved were communicated to the teachers individually and confidentially by the investigator who discussed the lacunae and the ways to overcome them. The teachers were encouraged to improve their teaching skills.

RESULTS

The Questionnaire system was found to be inexpensive and conducted smoothly. Evaluation system through questionnaire was acceptable to teachers in the department. A total of 1114 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to 100 students through 12 teaching sessions. Many teachers who participated in the study opined that the system was useful to identify lacunae in their teaching.

DISCUSSION

Presentation skills (content, objectives, media chosen, effective use of media, speech qualities, confidence level etc.) form the core of teaching skills; they were given maximum weightage in the questionnaire (65%). Management of class (time and discipline management) being integral parts of teaching were also given due weightage in the questionnaire (20%). Motivation by arousing the students' interest in the subject increases concentration and attention and can lead to improved long term knowledge. Hence it was included in the questionnaire (15%). In the present study, the scores achieved by the Tutors (58.5%) were lower than assistant professors (74.9%) in all teaching skills studied (Table-I). This may be due to their insufficient subject knowledge, lack of training in teaching technology and lack of / less teaching experience.

This suggests that the tutors should receive training in teaching techniques and have sufficient subject knowledge which can be tested prior to teaching sessions. All the assistant professors scored well than tutors in all parameters of the study.

In the present study, the average scores achieved by the all teachers in management skills (79.4%) show that it was effective for most of the teaching sessions. In the present study, the scores achieved by all teachers for motivational skills show a lot of individual variation. This indicates that many teachers did not give due attention to it during teaching.

Trigwell et al. described different 'approaches' that teachers take towards teaching. They have identified two main approaches: Teacher Focus (in which the teacher is concerned primarily with the organization, presentation and testing of content and their own teaching behaviour, with the goal that students acquire information) and Student Focus (in which the teacher is concerned primarily with supporting student learning, so that they acquire or develop concepts). When trainers are oriented towards changing the teachers' approach to teaching they can, therefore, have a reasonable expectation that, if they are successful, this will improve both student learning processes and outcomes.¹³ It has indeed been suggested that the routine use of questionnaires to obtain students' evaluations of their teachers promotes an uncritical acceptance of traditional conceptions of teaching based on the bare transmission of knowledge and the neglect of more sophisticated conceptions concerned with the promotion of critical thinking and self-expression.¹⁴ The need to evaluate the competency and efficiency of teachers and thus to assess their teaching has been expressed from time to time.¹⁵ However considering the number of students, there is need and scope for further improvement of the teaching in the department as a whole as well as of individual teachers.

CONCLUSION

Student feedback constitutes a major source of evidence for assessing teaching quality; that it can be used to inform attempts to improve teaching quality and that student feedback can be communicated in a way that is informative to future students. The present study can help to design a model evaluation system which, by using update data about teaching can play a key role in review, modifications, and hence evolution of the curriculum. The present study is an attempt to formulate an assessment system for undergraduate teaching. The participation by both the teachers and students was voluntary which resulted in an honest attempt to assess one's own teaching.

REFERENCES

1. Thorndike EL. Education. New York: MacMillan 1912.
2. Eraut M. Feedback. Learning in Health and Social Care; 2006; 5(3), 111–118.
3. Wiggins GP. Assessing Student Performance Exploring the Purpose and Limits of Testing. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1993.
4. Wood BP. Feedback: a key feature of medical training; Radiology; 2000; 215, 17–19.
5. Rokade SA, Sant SM, Vaidya SA, Mane AK. Developing an evaluation system for undergraduate teaching. South East Asian Journal of Medical Education; 2008; 2(2), 9-13.
6. Hattie JA. Measuring the effects of schooling. Aust J Educ; 1992; 36(1):5–13.
7. Bing-You RG, Bertsch T, Thompson JA. Coaching medical students in receiving effective feedback. Teach Learn Med; 1998; 10(4):228–31.

Student feedback of teaching skills

8. Brukner H, Altkorn DL, Cook S, Quinn MT, McNabb WL. Giving effective feedback to medical students: a workshop for faculty and house staff. *Med Teach* 1999; 21(2):161–5.
9. Rogers DA, Regehr G, Howdieshell T, Yeh K, Palm E. The impact of external feedback on computer-assisted learning for surgical technical skill training. *Am J Surg*; 2000; 179(4):341.
10. Branch WT Jr, Paranjape A. Feedback and reflection: teaching methods for clinical settings. *Acad Med*; 2002;77(12.1): 4.
11. Martin JA & Carey RM. The student initiated, faculty assisted system of evaluation of clinical training at the University of Virginia, *Academic Medicine*; 1991; 66,773-775.
12. Eaton DGM & Levene MI. Students' feedback: influencing the quality of teaching in a pediatric module, *Medical Education*, 1997; 31, 190-193.
13. Trigwell K, Pros ERM & Taylor P. Qualitative Differences in Approaches to Teaching First Year University Science, *Higher Education*; 1994; 27: 75–84.
14. Kolitch E & Dean AV. Student ratings of instruction in the USA: hidden assumptions and missing conceptions about 'good' teaching, *Studies in Higher Education*; 1999; 24, 27–42.
15. Irby DM. Faculty development and academic vitality, *Academic Medicine*; 1993; 68, 760-763.

Table 1: Results achieved by teachers in anatomy department (Mean %)

Teacher (n)	No. of responses	Presentation	Management	Motivation	Average Score
Assistant Professor (3)	843	74.1	82.2	69.2	74.9
Tutors (3)	271	56.1	70.6	52.5	58.5
Total	1114	69.7	79.4	65.1	70.9

Corresponding Author:

Pawan K Mahato, Tutor, Department of Anatomy, SGT Medical College, Budhera, Gurgaon, Haryana (INDIA). **Contact.** +91- 9818440969. **Email Id:** pawanmahato12@gmail.com

How to cite the article: Mahato PK, Saxena A, Kirandeep K. Student feedback of teaching skills in medical education. *Int J Med Res Prof*; 2015, 1(1);27-31.

Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire

Name of student:

Roll No:

Teacher's name:

Date:

Presentation

Q 1: Whether educational objectives of topic were explained in start of lecture?

Yes No

Q 2: Whether any audio-visual aids were used during lecture?

Yes No

Student feedback of teaching skills

Q 3: Whether teacher explained content clearly and in ways that are easy to understand, offers alternative explanations or additional examples, and clears up confusion?

Yes No

Q 4: Whether content delivered by teacher was in sequence either by chalk-board or ppt or any other means?

Yes No

Q 5: Teacher speech was effective and not monotonous (Voice modulations were there)?

Yes No

Q 6: Whether teacher's voice audible, clear and understandable?

Yes No

Q 7: Whether speech was fluent?

Yes No

Q 8: Whether teacher was confident and not anxious during lecture?

Yes No

Q 9: Whether teacher used tools for changing mood of audience like jokes, pauses etc. during lecture?

Yes No

Q 10: Whether most important points were stressed by teacher or dictated by teacher or written on black-board?

Yes No

Q 11: Whether teacher simplified content for better understanding of students?

Yes No

Q 12: Whether teacher summarised at the end of lecture?

Yes No

Q 13: Whether teacher was well organized and prepared about the topic for lecture?

Yes No

Management

Q 14: Whether class started on time?

Yes No

Q 15: Whether teacher was well organized and prepared about the topic for lecture?

Yes No

Q 16: Whether teacher maintained enough classroom discipline so the students can learn?

Yes No

Q 17: Whether class time was used in an efficient and productive manner?

Yes No

Motivation

Q 18: Whether teacher encourages students to ask questions, telling answers, participate in discussions and activities?

Yes No

Q 19: Whether explanations given by teacher to questions were satisfactory?

Yes No

Q 20: Whether teacher aroused critical thinking about topic in students mind?

Yes No

Signature of student