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BACKGROUND

➢ Family-centered rounds (FCR) are held at bedside and involve multiple members of the health care team.
➢ FCR allow patients and families to participate in the presentation and plan.
➢ Studies show that FCR improve family satisfaction and that medical students find FCR beneficial to families.
➢ Medical students’ concerns about FCR include longer rounds, decreased bedside teaching, and the lack of opportunities to improve FCR skills.
➢ We developed an FCR simulation for medical students to help improve their presentations during their pediatric clerkship.
➢ We also wanted to measure and improve medical students’ perceptions about FCR.

METHODS

➢ Medical students given an admission note to present prior to the simulation.
➢ Two evaluators acted as an attending and a patient’s parent.
➢ Feedback was provided at the end of the simulation.
➢ Students completed anonymous surveys after completing the simulation and at the end of their pediatric clerkship.

RESULTS

➢ N of 185 and 190 for initial and final surveys, respectively
➢ 91% of medical students had never done FCR prior to clerkship
➢ 57% were uncomfortable with FCR prior to simulation
➢ 87% felt the simulation helped them prepare for FCR
➢ 93% participated in FCR during their clerkship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCR better for...</th>
<th>Average score (pre)</th>
<th>Average score (post)</th>
<th>t-test p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall medical care</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient/family</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical team</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student education</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of rounds</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did medical student’s perceptions of FCR change during their pediatrics clerkship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

➢ Most students found our simulation helpful, likely since most had never participated in FCR before and were thus uncomfortable presenting in that style.
➢ Small changes in perceptions about FCR at the end of the clerkship were likely due in part to a ceiling effect from the initial survey.
➢ Despite worse perceptions of the benefits of FCR for the medical team and nursing at the end of the clerkship, student still had improved perceptions of the benefits for overall medical care.
➢ Worsening perceptions about the benefits of FCR for the medical team/nursing and efficiency may be related.
➢ Most students had more positive perceptions of FCR at the end of their clerkship, likely due to their beliefs that FCR is better for medical care and medical education.
➢ Despite statistical significance, the real-world difference in perceptions at the end of the clerkship appears minimal for most areas assessed.
➢ Limitations include no data surveying students prior to the introduction of the simulation.
➢ Future directions include surveying faculty, housestaff, and families to evaluate for improvement in medical student presentations and satisfaction.
➢ We are also interested in implementing this simulation at another medical school where pre-simulation data can be obtained.
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