Attachment 3: Practical Example Lecturer Training

Title/keyword of the training	Feedback in everyday clinical practice
Authors	Anja Härtl, Claudia Kiessling
Institution	University Hospital Munich, Institute for Medical Didactics and Education
Setting	Teacher training as part of a 2.5-day faculty development workshop; feedback is practiced as part of microteaching in small groups with teachers.
Aim	Participants learn to give constructive feedback to colleagues in everyday clinical practice regardless of their position in the hierarchy
Feedback giver	Teachrs in human medicine with teaching and assessment experience
Feedback receiver	Teachers in human medicine with teaching and assessmentexperience
Feedback material	Short educational vidoe (example of a discharge consultation)
Feedback type	Direct verbal feedback to a participant who takes on the role of the doctor from the educational video
Procedure	The inductive teaching concept is based on the AVIVA Model¹ for the development of teaching units. The unit lasts 45 minutes with a group of 8 to 36 participants and one or two facilitators. Arrive and prep: Brainstorm where and when you might encounter feedback in a private and professional context Activate prior knowledge: Examples of participants of positive feedback experiences – by paraphrasing the examples the facilitators note the first feedback rules on a flipchart Inform: brief input on feedback/feedup/feedforward, goal orientation in the feedback process and the importance of feedback in teaching Process: 90 sec video clip of a ward round with observation task; formulate feedback in 3 steps (1st collect feedback in teams of two, then as a group; 2nd prioritize; 3rd formulate the start of the feedback in new teams of two in writing) Evaluate: Role play (3 rounds); conducting a feedback conversation, the feedback recipient takes on three different levels of reflection (reflected and own solution ideas; reflected and no solution ideas; not reflected); each round of feedback on feedback from the feedback giver, feedback recipient, group and facilitators – additional rules for feedback are generated Finally, a summary by facilitators and transition to microteaching.
Rationale	The inductive teaching concept aims a highlighting to the participants right from the start that feedback is an individual process despite general rules. This is not only influenced by the feedback giver but also by the feedback recipient, who takes on a different level of reflection when instructed by the facilitators. The independent

Attachment 3 to: Thrien C, Fabry G, Härtl A, Kiessling C, Graupe T, Preusche I, Pruskil S, Schnabel K, Sennekamp M, Rüttermann S, Wünsch A. *Feedback in medical education – a workshop report with practical examples and recommendations*. GMS J Med Educ. 2020;37(5):Doc46.

DOI: 10.3205/zma001339

	development of feedback rules supports the transfer into one's own actions. In role plays, the participants learn through self-awareness, observation and giving feedback on the feedback that has just been observed.
Literature	¹ Städeli, Ch., Grassi, A, Rhiner, K. & Obrist. W. (2010) Kompetenzorientiert unterrichten. Das AVIVA-Modell. Bern: hep- verlag
Experiences	Participants evaluated the inductive approach positively, the documentation on the flipchart is essential in order to visualize the ideas and rules developed for feedback. Compared to the previous lesson on feedback, which used a more deductive approach, there was significantly less resistance among the participants when it came to formulating feedback. Depending on the previous experience of the participants, fundamental rules for the feedback process should be worked out in more detail.
Further development	Identify aids that would allow quicker adaption of the feedback to the level of reflection of the other person.

Attachment 3 to: Thrien C, Fabry G, Härtl A, Kiessling C, Graupe T, Preusche I, Pruskil S, Schnabel K, Sennekamp M, Rüttermann S, Wünsch A. *Feedback in medical education – a workshop report with practical examples and recommendations*. GMS J Med Educ. 2020;37(5):Doc46.

DOI: 10.3205/zma001339