

Letter to the Editor

AMJ 2017 10(7)

Faculty perspectives on "Foundations in Teaching and Learning" training workshop

Corresponding Author:

Abdus Salam

Faculty of Medicine, Asia Metropolitan University, Malaysia

Email: salam@amu.edu.my

Dear Editor,

Faculties are the scholarly asset of medical schools, and a faculty development program is an integral part for any educational institution to create links between theory and practices. Asia Metropolitan University (AMU) is one of the growing private universities in Malaysia, faculty of medicine of which has developed an annual faculty development planner for year 2017 as a part of continuous professional developmental activities. The first workshop was held on Foundations in Teaching and Learning. The objective of this paper is to highlight the perspectives of the faculty on the Foundation in Teaching Learning training workshop aimed at future educational and training development.

The workshop was organized by the Medical Education and Quality Assurance Committee at Muar Resource Centre AMU, held on 3rd February 2017. It was attended by nine members of the AMU medical faculty from various disciplines. At the end, the workshop was evaluated by administering a survey-questionnaire that contained relevant workshop items as shown in Table-1, with a few open-ended questions. A 5-point Likert scale² was used to rate the items ranging from 5-as excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-poor and 1-as very poor. We present the evaluation findings as number and percent distribution.

The response rate of the study was 100 per cent. The over all usefulness of the workshop was rated as very good by 67 per cent and as excellent by 33 per cent participants. The responses of an open-ended question regarding the new ideas that they gained was very encouraging. Participants stated that the workshop was very helpful and by attending it, they gained knowledge on learning theories and principles, teaching-learning methods and system

approaches in events of instructions. In response to another question, participants reported that they will be more systematic and will improve the presentation of teaching as well as using pictures and video clips to make teaching interesting. They demanded more workshops which reflect their needs and motivation.

Teaching can be offered best by relating to TEA: tell, explain and assess. Input, process and output are system approaches in education and training. Aligning the objective, content, method and assessment is vital to ensure the quality in education and training process. It is important to conduct training workshops applying the system approach to ensure quality in faculty development and to get the participants motivated. Medical schools by implementing a continual faculty development plan can support faculty to achieve improved outcomes. Higher educational institutions should address the needs of faculty and ensure continuous high-quality training for sustainable organisational development.

Table 1: Faculty perspectives against relevant workshop items, n=9

Items	Excellent		Very good		Good	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Objectives and content	4	44	4	45	1	11
Teaching learning concept	2	22	6	67	1	11
Learning theories, teaching	4	45	4	44	1	11
methods and approaches						
Plan & events of instruction	4	44	4	45	1	11
in delivery of teaching						
Group exercise	1	11	7	78	1	11
Venue of workshop	1	11	5	56	3	33
Time & duration of workshop	1	11	4	44	4	45
Overall workshop usefulness	3	33	6	67	-	-

This paper was presented at the 12th International Medical Educational Conference held in International Medical University Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 7-9 April 2017.

Sincerely,

Abdus Salam, Mohamad Khairuddin Bin Abdul Wahab, Amaluddin Ahamad, Nasaruddin Bin Abdul Aziz Faculty of Medicine, Asia Metropolitan University, Malaysia



Reference

- Salam A, Mohamad N, Siraj HH, Kamarudin MA, Yaman MN, Bujang SM. Team-based learning in a medical centre in Malaysia: Perspectives of the faculty. Natl Med J India. 2014;27(6):350.
- 2. Likert R. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Arch Psychol. 1932;22:5-55.