# ASSESSMENT DETAILS

- <u>Group</u>: Year 2 Medical Science students

- <u>Module</u>: Scientific and Professional Communication (Semester 1)

- Classes were being run on Microsoft Teams

- Learning outcomes for this module:

| | Learning Outcomes<br>*On completion of this module the learner will/should be able to:* |
|---|---|
| 1. | Plan, design and deliver professional effective oral and written communication ethically, using appropriate medium. |
| 2. | Produce professional written documentation following accepted conventions of design, structure and content which is grammatically and technically correct. |
| 3. | Identify ethically appropriate means to communicate patient medical results as a medical scientist. |
| 4. | Reflect on participation with groups and identify ways on which to improve their individual performance. |
| 5. | Discriminate between information sources and reference all sources of information using the Harvard referencing style. |

# ASSESSMENT TOPIC

- Ethical Communication of Patient Results as a Medial Scientist
- Consideration of patient outcomes due to poor communication
  - Covered a case study of a story from a patient advocate

Communication of Critical Results for Patients in the Community
National Laboratory Handbook

Institute of Biomedical Science

Communication of Pathology Results

# ASSESSMENT DESIGN

- Assessment was carried out remotely

- Weighting of assessment: 15%

- Design:
  - Two questions: worth 7.5% each
  - Timing: 1 hour

- The innovative nature of this assessment was achieved by changing the focus of the questions.

# ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Q.1 Outline the **classification** of critical patient results according to the "Communication of Critical Results for Patients in the Community National Laboratory Handbook" and explain your **role as a medical scientist** for each category.

Give an example of **one analyte within each category** and briefly discuss why it has been designated within that category.

# ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Q.2. Outline **3 ways** a medical scientist can **reduce the possibility of transcription errors** while giving critical results **verbally** to health practitioners.

Briefly explain the potential **impacts** of transcription errors on patient care.

# MARKING THE ASSIGNMENT

- Grading rubric with feedback was created on Moodle for marking.

| Question 1 - | No attempt to outline classification of critical patient results or reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>0 points | Brief mention of classification of critical patient results and reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>1 points | Fair outline of classification of critical patient results and reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>2 points | Good outline of classification of critical patient results and reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>3 points | Very good outline of classification of critical patient results and reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>4 points | Excellent outline of classification of critical patient results and reference to your role as a medical scientist for each category<br><br>5 points | More detail needed on your role as a medical scientist if |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question 1 - | No example of analyte within any category<br><br>0 points | Example of analyte within one or more categories with no explanation<br><br>1 points | Example of analyte within one or more categories with some explanation<br><br>2 points | Example of analyte within one or more categories with good explanation<br><br>3 points | Example of analyte within one or more categories with very good explanation<br><br>4 points | Example of analyte within one or more categories with excellent explanation<br><br>5 points | Include cut off values and units when mentioning |

# MARKING THE ASSIGNMENT

| Question 2 - | No attempt to outline 3 ways a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Provided 1 way that a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Provided 2 ways that a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Provided 3 good ways that a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Provided 3 very good ways that a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Provided 3 excellent ways that a medical scientist can reduce transcription errors when giving results verbally | Iterating urgency would not prevent a transcriptio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 points | 1 points | 2 points | 3 points | 4 points | 5 points | |
| Question 2 - | No attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Brief attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Fair attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Good attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Very good attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Excellent attempt to explain the impacts of transcription errors | Further consideration of the impact of transcriptio |
| | 0 points | 1 points | 2 points | 3 points | 4 points | 5 points | |

- Due to the use of a marking rubric results of the assignment were returned to the students in a timely manner and general feedback was covered in class soon after the assessment.

# STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- **Question design** could be improved upon –
  - Clearer if questions were broken down into **subparts**.

- Changing the **focus** of the questions made the students take what was discussed in class and add their **own opinion.**

- Q.1 enabled them to bring in **information from other modules** they were studying when it asked them to discuss why the analyte they choose had been designated in a high or low risk category.

- Q.2 made them consider the potential **impacts upon the patient** if communication errors occur – something unique to this module.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Dr Brian Moran and Dr Sheila Flaherty who designed and developed this module.

- Dr Mary McGrath and Dr Eleanor Rainsford for inviting me to present today.

- Emma McDonald for organising this symposium.