

Video Killed the (Bad) Educator

Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

Elizabeth Ryan EdD, Lauren Taylor MEd, Peter Scott BS & Jon Lomasney MD

Advances in educational technology, first used to help students study, are now being utilized in faculty development. In 2008-2009 Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine (NUFSM) began digital capture of lectures in the second year course Scientific Basis of Medicine (SBM). Initially solely thought to be a resource for students, it is now shown to improve the prowess of lecturers.

This pilot faculty development program:

- recruited volunteer SBM faculty to watch their own lectures
- had participants complete a self-assessment based on a behavior checklist and:
 - identify strengths and areas for improvement
 - meet with a medical educator, who watched the lecture and filled out the same assessment
 - receive feedback on their performance anchored to the checklist and create an improvement plan for subsequent delivery of the lecture
 - have the subsequent lecture assessed by an educator and compared to the pre-intervention lecture

	Educator Assessment			
	Pre		Post	
	Demonstrated YES	NO	Demonstrated YES	NO
Setting The Stage				
Used attention grabber	1	7	6	2
Stated learning objectives	5	3	7	1
Explained relevance	3	5	7	1
Stated main points or take home message		8	4	4
Presentation Structure/ Delivery				
Content was organized	7	1	8	
Content was concise	7	1	7	1
Used appropriate format (diagrams, pictures, images, etc to help communicate message)	8		8	
Provided supporting materials	8		6	2
Main points were clear and limited to 5 ± 2	2	6	6	2
Taught general principles without introducing new material	8		8	
Provided summary of major principles without introducing new material	4	4	5	3
Stimulated further thought		8	2	6
Communication Skills				
Used appropriate voice (volume, pace and enunciation), gestures, movement, eye contact	7	1	8	
Avoided use of repeated words such as "um, ok, etc"	8		8	
Engaged students- probed their understanding, asked questions, invited their participation/ interpretation		8	5	3
Knowledge Integration				
Highlighted basic science in a clinical context	7	1	8	
Used interactive knowledge application exercises (think/pair/share, case presentation, small group, audience response system)		8	5	3
Information Literacy				
Cited sources (e.g. pictures, graphs, content in presentation)	6	2	7	
Additional Comments:				

Number of Participants: 8

•5 more faculty expressed interest but because of scheduling conflicts or lack of video tape they were not able to participate

Findings:

1. Do the lecturers perceive this type of activity as beneficial? **YES**

Participant Rated Helpful Characteristics	Mean (1 most – 5 least)
Meeting with a medical educator	1.75
Determining a plan for improvement	2.25
Availability to watch video with self-assessment checklist	2.5
Availability to watch video	3.52
Incorporating a new technology or resource into lecture	3.67

2. Did the participants make substantive changes to their lecture based on this intervention? **YES**

Checklist items most frequently incorporated into subsequent lectures:

- used attention grabber
- stated learning objectives
- explained relevance
- main points were clear and limited to 5±2
- engaged students
- used interactive knowledge application exercise(s)

Faculty Feedback Excerpts

1. **What did you like and/or dislike about this experience?**
 - It was good objective feedback
 - I appreciated the direct feedback and concrete suggestions
 - I liked the ability to view the lecture video and get guidance on improving my presentation skills
2. **Were there factors that affected making changes to your presentations this year?**
 - After meeting with a medical educator and going over my video from last year I tried to summarize the main points of my lecture and include the audience response system
 - Some time limit issues, but I was able to make some basic changes
 - I used the feedback to alter slides, although I wish I had more lead time and a template to work from
 - Yes, I was able to focus on a few key areas to improve the clarity of my lecture slides and focus on key concepts, rather than a comprehensive discussion on the entire topic. I also improved my interaction with the audience and included questions during the lecture.
3. **Would you recommend this faculty development program to a colleague?**
 - Yes, I think it is very constructive
 - Yes, it was helpful to better understand expectations
4. **What recommendations for improvement would you suggest?**
 - Give more of a standard format (e.g., instructions ahead of time so we have a better idea of how to structure the talks)
 - The option of a "practice session" with student volunteers to get specific feedback about the clarity and "understandability" of the lectures
 - More lead time
 - Give a template