

# Evaluating the impact of faculty development workshops on implementation of structured verbal feedback

**Authors:** Muhammad Tariq, John Boulet, Afaq Motiwala, Sana Saeed and Tabassum Zehra

## Aims

Feedback is the focused information given to the learner on their performance. It is easier said than done. We aim to develop a system of structured verbal feedback (in addition to the written record of assessment) given by the faculty to the residents to strengthen the residency education in internal medicine. We hereby report the effectiveness of conducting workshops on improving the feedback skills of the faculty.

## Methods

This was a quasi-experimental study, conducted at the department of medicine, Aga Khan University.

**Intervention:** Five workshops were conducted by a group of clinicians and medical educationists, using roleplay as the teaching strategy. Forty-eight out of 55 faculty members participated in these workshops.

**Pre- and post-intervention feedback:** A questionnaire based on the 7-point Likert scale was used for collecting residents' and faculty's perspectives regarding the feedback process.

**Analysis:** Repeated measure analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA) was used to compare the faculty satisfaction level before and after the intervention. Paired t-test was applied to assess the effect of workshop intervention on resident satisfaction.

## Results

Mean satisfaction scores of residents were significantly improved after the intervention ( $p < 0.01$ ). Pre- and post-intervention faculty satisfaction score was significantly improved from 4.27 to 5.28 as measured by RM-ANOVA ( $p = 0.0477$ ).

## Conclusion

Feedback facilitates in encouraging the learners to improve their knowledge, attitude and skills. This study demonstrated improvement in the overall feedback process using one intervention. Such activities need to be regularly planned for faculty development in areas which are underestimated yet are pivotal in training programs. ■

## Conflict of interest statement

There is no conflict of interest.

## Disclosure of interest

None declared.

**Table 1. Summary of results**

Items	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention	p-value
Environment in which feedback provided was congenial	1.83 ± 0.37	4.33 ± 1.99	<0.001
Feedback being provided was timely	2.83 ± 2.32	3.69 ± 2.03	0.09
My views were taken during the feedback session	1.98 ± 1.54	3.98 ± 2.11	<0.001
Chance was given to assess my own strengths and weaknesses	1.73 ± 1.51	3.93 ± 1.97	<0.001
Feedback given was non-judgmental	1.60 ± 1.42	3.70 ± 2.07	<0.001
Feedback sessions focused on specific aspects	2.10 ± 1.66	3.64 ± 1.79	<0.001
Feedback identified the root cause of the problems	2.20 ± 1.67	3.78 ± 1.93	0.001
Through feedback, ideas were shared to improve upon the weak or deficient areas	2.12 ± 1.63	3.68 ± 1.95	0.001
Commitment for follow up	2.10 ± 1.71	3.37 ± 1.99	0.005

**Authors:** No affiliation provided

**Table 2. Multivariate analysis of variance test criteria and exact *F* statistics for the hypothesis of no survey effect**

Statistic	Value	<i>F</i>	Num df	Den df	Pr> <i>F</i>
Wilks' lambda	0.74825900	4.71	1	14	0.0477
Pillai's trace	0.25174100	4.71	1	14	0.0477
Hotelling-Lawley trace	0.33643565	4.71	1	14	0.0477
Roy's greatest root	0.33643565	4.71	1	14	0.0477

ANOVA = analysis of variance; df = degrees of freedom.