



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 22 - 27

Analysis of feedbacks of HSET Workshop held at Ahmednagar Homoeopathic Medical College, Ahmednagar from 17 September to 19 September 2019

Dr. Santoshkumar A. Gite*¹ and Dr. Rizwan Ahmed Shabbir Shaikh²

¹ M.D., Ph.D. (Homoeopathy), MBA, DYT, P.G.D.F (Forensic), P.G.H (London); Associate Professor, F.M.T., Ananya College of Homoeopathy, Kalol, Gujrat

² MD Paediatrics (Hom); Post Graduate Diploma in Clinical Research & Regulatory Affairs; Post Graduate Diploma in Nutrition; Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Ahmednagar Homoeopathic Medical College, Ahmednagar

Article Received: 10 / 11 / 2024

Article Published: 25 / 12 / 2024

*Corresponding Author: Dr. S.A. Gite

Email: santgite@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18847778>

ABSTRACT

Background – Under guidance of medical education technology department of MUHS, Nasik, We, Ahmednagar Homoeopathic medical College and Hospital conducted a workshop of Medical Education Technology on 17 September to 19 September 2019. Such workshops are mandatory for approved teachers of MUHS. University allowed only 30 participants for the workshop.

Methods – This is a community based cross sectional study which was done with help of feedbacks of participants of HSET workshop. Total 30 participants provided feedback forms. Study was completed at Ahmednagar homoeopathic medical College and Hospital Savedi Road, Ahmednagar. Ethical clearance was obtained from institutional ethical committee. After taking verbal permissions of participants, they were explained the purpose of the study.

Result – HSET workshops were found effective for MUHS Teachers. 26 (86.66%) participants felt that the objectives of the workshop were achieved.

100% participants noted that such activities are useful to the profession. 100% participants were sure for the implementation in their teachings.

Conclusion – Workshop improved quality of teaching and conceptual understanding of learning and teaching.

Keywords – Medical education Technology, MUHS's HSET workshop, Ahmednagar Homeopathic Medical College, Responses of participated teachers

1. INTRODUCTION:



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 22 - 27

Background – MUHS conducts workshops for health professionals as a faculty development activity on a regular basis. It is conducted through a co-ordinator from the college where the activity is going to be conducted. It gives general idea about teaching learning methods and media, adult learning principles, classroom management etc.

Objectives

1. To develop health care professionals as an ideal medical teacher.
2. How to select teaching learning methods for the respective topics.
3. Feedback and communication techniques.
4. General idea of Bloom's Taxonomy and Guilbert's Hierarchy.
5. Utility of Miller's pyramid for assessment methods.

Academic benefits of the workshop) –

1. To understand Course outcome
2. Objectives to write SLO
3. Preparation of lesson plan
4. Integrated teaching in the homoeopathy.

Current scenario - Current health care professionals are doctors and not the trained teachers. So, ability and experience of each teacher varies. New teachers face problems of selecting TL methods, confidence, assessments criteria etc. To engage students during non -lecture sessions or clinics is not easy task. It requires a skill. That's why it a need of hour to improve teaching ability.

Need for study – all 30 teachers from the institute participated in the workshop. While feedback writing, they expressed their views about workshop about what was good and what can be improved. So, we decided to conduct research.

Teacher benefit – Teachers of homoeopathic faculty definitely get new chain of a thought for their improvement. As it is compulsory for approval, so teacher participates, but to find out actual outcome and benefit of HSET conducted at AHMC we conducted the study based upon pre- test and post test scores.

2. METHODS

2.1. Objectives

- To develop health care professionals as an ideal medical teacher.
- Help to select appropriate TL methods and media.
- To understand importance of feedback and communication techniques.
- To adopt uniform methods of assessment.

2.2. Study design

Survey based Observational Study



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 22 - 27

2.3. Inclusion criteria – only participants of this HSET Workshop.

2.4. Exclusion criteria – coordinators, investigator will not take part in survey.

2.5. Criteria of assessment

- **Feedback form (Questionnaire)** (open ended questions)
 1. What were your aims and objectives about workshop?
 2. Do you learn any new things about teaching skills?
 3. Was it a revision of your old teaching skills?
 4. Do you feel the guidance was worth or not?
 5. Does the workshop have improved your skills?
 6. Did you make any changes in teaching methods?
 7. Is there any improvement in your body language and communication skills?
 8. Which things were new for you in the workshop?
 9. Enumerate the new things you have learnt.
 10. Do you feel that, your aims and objectives have been fulfilled by the workshop?
- **Pre-test and post test score (each out of 20)**

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PRE & POST TEST

(BASIC HSET WORKSHOP (17-09-2019 to 19-09-2019))

Sr. No	Name of the PARTICIPANTS	Pre-Test Score	Post Test Score
1.	Dr. VVK	13	11
2.	Dr. SNP	09	05
3.	Dr. PRS	10	11
4.	Dr. DSH	06	12
5.	Dr. PSA	06	13
6.	Dr. MAJ	12	11
7.	Dr. DIJ	11	09
8.	Dr. SVK	06	08
9.	Dr. SGV	09	10
10.	Dr. SMH	12	10
11.	Dr. KST	12	10
12.	Dr. SAW	15	13
13.	Dr. NSS	09	13
14.	Dr. MKB	03	12
15.	Dr. DMB	09	11
16.	Dr. NRD	10	20
17.	Dr. SSD	07	12
18.	Dr. UBK	09	12
19.	Dr. STS	08	15



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 22 - 27

20.	Dr. ASK	07	13
21.	Dr. RRS	08	13
22.	Dr. NAM	12	13
23.	Dr. NSV	08	07
24.	Dr. PAR	10	15
25.	Dr. BMI	11	12
26.	Dr. USD	08	13
27.	Dr. PBK	09	09
28.	Dr. ART	09	07
29.	Dr. KGP	05	05
30.	Dr. ASP	08	11

2.6. Data analysis

Data collected from pre-vis.-a-vis. Post-test score and Feedback form reply of all participants was present in the form of tables, graphs and percentages. Finally, interpretation was done on the basis of that.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Analysis of feedback form

Table No 1. Participants and their responses

Sr. No.	Questions	Number of Participants			% of participants		
		Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No	Not Sure
1.	Were objectives achieved?	26	2	2	86.67	6.67	6.67
2.	Is workshop useful to profession?	30	0	0	100	0	0
3.	Were faculties resourceful?	29	0	1	96.67	0	3.33
4.	Are you able to implement?	30	0	0	100	0	0

Table No 2. Response about balance of workshop

Sr. No.	Response	No of Participants	Percentage
1	Too much theory	06	20
2	Too much practical	01	3.33
3	Well balanced	23	76.67

Table No 3. Response about schedule management

Sr. No.	Response	No of Participants	Percentage
1	Tight program	02	6.66
2	Relaxed program	01	3.33
3	Optimum	27	90



THE HOMOEOPATHIC QUILL

ISSN: 3108-1215

Page no: 22 - 27

3.2. Analysis of Pre-test and Post test scores

Table No. 4. Distribution of Pre-test score

Sr. No.	Pre-test score	No of participants	Percentage
1	3 to 7	7	23.33
2	8 to 12	21	70
3	12 to 15	2	6.67
4.	Total	30	100

Table No. 6. Distribution of Post-test score

Sr. No.	Post-test score	No of participants	Percentage
1	5 to 10	7	23.33
2	11 to 15	22	73.33
3	16 to 20	1	3.33
4.	Total	30	100

Table No. 7. Pre-test score vs. Post-test score

Sr. No.	Participant's Pre-test score	No of participants	Average pre-test score	Average post-test score
1	3 to 7	7	5.71	10.71
2	8 to 12	21	9.66	11.28
3	12 to 15	2	14	12
4.	Total / Avg.	30	9.79	11.33

Table No. 8. Comparative analysis

Sr. No.	Comparative analysis	No of Participants	Percentage
1	Pre-test score increased	19	63.33
2	Pre-test score was same	2	6.67
3	Pre-test score decreased	9	30
4.	Total	30	100

4. CONCLUSION - New topics, changes in teaching methods, arrangement by the institute, Demonstrations and group activities. New ideas. Highly informative, applicable, Helpful for better communication. All resource persons were with knowledge of their topics. **Communication skills** topic was interesting. A.V. Aids is needful. **TEAMWORK was good**. HSET workshops were found effective for MUHS Teachers. 26 (86.66%) participants felt that the objectives of the workshop were achieved. 100% participants noted that such activities are useful to the profession. 100% participants were sure for the implementation in their teachings. Workshop improved quality of teaching and conceptual understanding of learning and teaching



Sources of supports- None

Funding – None

Conflict of interest – No

Ethical approval – Taken.

Acknowledgement – We sincerely thanks to Dr. B.R. Anbhule, Dr. D.S. Pawar, for their guidance technical help.

Criteria for Inclusion in the Authors List- Who worked in evaluation of feedbacks as investigators are included in the Authors List.

5. REFERENCES –

1. Ford JK, Anderson WA, Yelon SL, twelve tips for increasing transfer of training from faculty development programs, *Med Tech*2014;36:945-50.
2. Tim Swanwick, Kirsty Forrest, BC O'Brien, **Understanding medical education**, evidence, theory and practice, 3rd edition. 2019.Wiley Blackwell Publication.
3. Revised Basic Course Workshop in Medical Education Technology Dates: 4th to 6th July 2019 at CAIMS, Bommakal, KARIMNAGAR, Program Coordinator - Dr. A N R Lakshmi
4. PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING Stephen Lieb, Senior Technical Writer and Planner, Arizona Department of Health Services and part-time Instructor, South Mountain Community College from VISION, Fall 1991 <http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/FacDevCom/guidebk/teachtip/adults-2.htm> [Accessed 05.05.2010]
5. Jim Scrivener, *Learning Teaching*, third edition, Published by Macmillan books for teachers,
6. Dunnill R. Education—An anatomy of the discipline: Rescuing the university project? *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*. 2013;15(4):92-95
7. Ludmerer KM. The internal challenges to medical education. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association*. 2003;114-241
8. Lu J, Pan Z, Lin H, Zhang M, Shi J. Virtual learning environment for medical education based on VRML and VTK. *Computers & Graphics*. 2005;29(2):283-288
9. Ammann A, Kissb T, Klebbac Ä, Matthiesd HK. The next generation of patient education: Multilingual Dental Explorer 3D. *International Journal of Computerized Dentistry*. 2010;13(1):43-55
10. Jimison HB, Sher PP, Appleyard R, LeVernois Y. The use of multimedia in the informed consent process. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 1998;5(3):245-256
11. Ong LM, De Haes JC, Hoos AM, Lammes FB. Doctor-patient communication: A review of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine*. 1995;40(7):903-918