Successful & Unsuccessful Teaching Principles To Improve Medical Education



Stephen S. Davis, Ph.D. Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine, Office of Faculty Development, Athens, Oh (daviss2@ohio.edu, http://www.oucom.ohiou.edu/fd/)

Introduction

Continuous teaching improvement requires a system of feedback - most schools do this. However, we often fail in mining the feedback for pertinents.

By looking at student feedback in the aggregate over a year and a half we can:

- Mine data for "golden nuggets,"
- Help "close the loop" of evaluation,
- Confirm best practices,
- Support & Encourage faculty, and
- Provide a tool for self assessment to improve future teaching.

Methods

Like a chart review, 6 quarters (WI07 - SP08) of 1st and 2nd year osteopathic medical student comments (~3000 pages of feedback comments) were reviewed, highlighted, and key-word coded according to their positive and negative comments

 506 Negative comment codes & 1068 Positive comment codes.

The "key words" represent the gist of the comment. A second coder was employed for verification. Comments with their codes were transferred to a spreadsheet and sorted by frequency to derive the top 10 codes in each category.

Top 10 Unsuccessful Teaching Principles Rank Yourself: 1 guilty10 not-guilty.	Top 10 Successful Teaching Princip Rank Yourself: 1 poor 10 perfect
#1. Poor Organization:	#1. Fully Committed /Helpful:
"Lab was so disorganizedit was awful"	"go to the end of the earth to help"
#2. Poor Presentations:	#2. Organized:
□	gr ⊔ -
"Too many slidesdisjointed"	"Well organized and easy to follow"
#3. Unprofessional:	#3. Jazzed!/Enthusiastic:
"Inappropriate gestures, language and attitude"	"passion and love shows through"
#4. Poor Time Management:	#4. Student Focused:
"Rushed, unfinished, off-topic"	"Make our learning a priority" "care
#5. Poor Speaking Skills:	#5. Feedback and Technology:
"Talks very fasthard to follow"	"labeled PowerPoint – great"
#6. Poor Teaching Skills:	#6. Engaging:
"Copy/paste textbooknot us oful"	"interactive & stimulated our thinking
#7. Hands-Off:	#7. Student Friendly:
"Never available – unapproachable"	"Respectful and approachable"
#8. Non-Engaging:	#8. Sought Improvement:
"Lacking in student interaction"	"Asked for feedbackchanged - better
#9. Didn't Seem Knowledgeable:	#9. Correct Level of Difficulty:
"Contradicting – vague"	"explained until we understood"
#10. Incorrect Difficulty Level:	#10. Knowledgeable:
"Too in-depth for first year level"	"Clearly knew the material well"
Pick lowest score in each column - write 1 thing	to move it one click to the right

Results

Two top ten lists – top 10 positive comments and top 10 negative comments.

Results are consistent with similar research from a 1988 study on desirable professor traits (Feldman KA. Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities? Research in Higher Education. 1988;28(4):291-344.)

Conclusion

- 1. See what students appreciate, and don't
- Seven negatives can be improved with just two of the positives.
- Personal application: self-assessment and faculty development in specific areas of concern.

When presented to our faculty they said the MOST IMPORTANT THING LEARNED WAS:

- Be engaged and organized
- · ...a caring attitude towards students
- Use technology be engaging
- Student perceptions/expectations

Resources:

Please visit our Faculty Development website for the full slide presentation http://www.oucom.ohiou.edu/fd/programs.htm.

This material may be copied and used freely if you acknowledge the source.