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Background

• National priority: recruiting/retaining effective ambulatory preceptors is a key focus of the STFM*
• National/Local challenge: finding and retaining enough skilled preceptors to meet demand
  • Ambulatory clerkships (Family Medicine and Ambulatory Medicine) heavily dependent upon on skilled community preceptors
• Opportunity: STFM/ABFM collaborative Preceptor Improvement Project*  
  • Faculty development
  • MOC Part IV credit

Methods – Phase One

• Assessment of learning needs/priorities and pre-intervention skill/knowledge level (STFM Teaching Skills Self-Assessment Tool for Faculty)
  • Most frequently identified learning needs/priorities:
    • Time management/efficiency
    • Improving the learner’s performance
    • Professionalism
  • Assessment of local resources re: content, expertise, coordination, liaison with sponsoring national organizations
  • Arrangement of venue, technology and timing to facilitate participation
    • Sessions live-streamed and archived

Methods – Phase Two

• Intervention held on site at HEWHC
  • Four 90-minute sessions
    • Microskills and adult learners (SNAPPS method)
    • Feedback: Concepts, obstacles, skill development
    • Professionalism in the learner
    • Observation in the clinical setting
  • Brief didactics and interactive, case-based discussions
  • Introduction to established models
  • Parallels between clinical teaching and clinical care
  • Peer discussion re: best practices
  • Personal reflection
  • Interdisciplinary focus

Methods – Phase Three

• Assessment of learning needs/priorities and post-intervention skill/knowledge level

Results

10 participants (6 physicians)
Average pre (N=10) and post (N=9) intervention scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting expectations with learners</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing learner needs</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting teaching style based on learner needs</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observational skills</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching physical exam skills</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving constructive feedback</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing learner skills</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a struggling learner</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION FOR LEARNERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of medical school expectations of clinical teaching</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal time management skills when working with a student</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff preparation for hosting clinical learners</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall site preparation for hosting clinical learners</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONALISM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify unprofessional behavior in a learner</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of next steps if unprofessional behavior is identified</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of medical school’s student harassment policy</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to review or debrief a difficult or unexpected experience with a student</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

• Intervention appears effective at increasing preceptor self-report of skill/knowledge level
• Effort required to coordinate is reasonable and sustainable
• Pilot program is adaptable to scalability
• Ability to earn MOC credit is innovative and highly valued by physician preceptors
• Education was valued by all participants, even those not eligible to receive credit

Next Steps

• STFM/ABFM have approved for continuation and expansion through 2021
• Adapting format and content to a distance education platform
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