

Optimizing Educational Efficiency: Exploring The Relationship Between Bulk and Clinical Rotation Group Size in Medical Education Students' Perspective in Busitema University Uganda

Abingwa John Patick¹, Salvatore Fava², Yahaya Gavamukulya³,
Owori Francis⁴

¹Senior lecturer, Department of Surgery, Busitema University

²Department of Health profession and Education Management, Selinus University

³Department of Bio Chemistry and Molecular Biology, Busitema University

⁴Lecturer, Department of Surgery Busitema University

Abstract:

Clinical rotation group size plays a pivotal role in shaping the quality, efficiency, and overall student experience in medical education. Despite its significance, determining the ideal group size remains a daunting task. This research endeavors to delve into the correlation between group size and what is termed as "bulk," representing the comprehensive efficiency and productivity of clinical rotation groups. By examining this relationship, the study aims to offer valuable insights into potential strategies for optimizing group size, thereby enhancing the educational experience for medical students.

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative analysis of productivity metrics with qualitative assessments of student and faculty perceptions. Surveys, interviews, and observational data were utilized to capture the nuances of group dynamics, learning outcomes, and resource utilization across different group sizes. Statistical techniques such as regression analysis and ANOVA were employed to identify significant correlations and differences.

Data were collected from medical students undergoing clinical rotations across multiple specialties. Group sizes varied from small (2-3) and large (4 and more). The study measured bulk using indicators such as patient encounters per student, learning outcomes, and faculty-student interaction. Results indicated a nonlinear relationship between bulk and group size. Smaller groups showed higher individual student engagement, personalized learning experiences, and increased faculty-student interaction. Conversely, larger groups exhibited greater overall productivity due to economies of scale and enhanced peer learning. However, beyond a certain threshold, further increases in group size led to diminishing returns, compromising individualized attention and educational quality.

The findings underscore the importance of balancing group size to optimize educational outcomes in clinical rotations. While larger groups may offer efficiency gains, they must be carefully managed to mitigate potential drawbacks such as reduced individualized attention and faculty-student interaction.

Smaller groups foster a more personalized learning environment but may lack the resource utilization efficiency of larger cohorts. Institutions should consider contextual factors such as specialty, learning objectives, and available resources when determining optimal group sizes.

In conclusion, the relationship between bulk and clinical rotation group size is complex, with both benefits and limitations associated with different group sizes. Institutions should strive to strike a balance between efficiency and educational quality by tailoring group sizes to specific contexts and objectives. Further research is needed to explore additional factors influencing bulk and to develop targeted interventions for optimizing clinical rotation experiences.

Keywords: Education efficiency, Bulk, Clinical Rotation

Introduction

In the realm of medical education, clinical rotations serve as pivotal experiences, bridging theoretical knowledge with practical application in real-world healthcare settings. The effectiveness of these rotations is influenced by various factors, among which the size of the rotation groups plays a significant role. Within the context of Busitema University's Faculty of Health Sciences, where aspiring healthcare professionals are molded, understanding the dynamics of bulk size as a function of clinical rotation groups is crucial for optimizing the educational experience. [1]

As the demand for healthcare professionals continues to rise globally, institutions like Busitema University face the challenge of ensuring that their graduates are adequately prepared to meet the evolving needs of healthcare delivery. Clinical rotations serve as invaluable opportunities for students to gain hands-on experience, develop clinical skills, and cultivate professional attitudes under the guidance of seasoned mentors. However, the optimal configuration of these rotations, particularly concerning group size, remains a topic of ongoing exploration and debate. [2, 3]

In the pursuit of excellence in medical education, it becomes imperative to delve into the intricacies of how the size of clinical rotation groups impacts what we refer to as "bulk" – a comprehensive measure encompassing not only productivity and efficiency but also the quality of learning experiences for students. At Busitema University, where the Faculty of Health Sciences endeavors to produce competent, compassionate, and ethically sound healthcare professionals, understanding the nuances of bulk size becomes paramount. [4]

This research study seeks to address this gap in understanding by investigating the relationship between bulk size and clinical rotation groups within the specific context of Busitema University's Faculty of Health Sciences. By examining various metrics such as patient encounters per student, faculty-student interaction, and learning outcomes across different group sizes, this study aims to provide actionable insights that can inform decision-making processes related to the design and implementation of clinical rotations. [5, 6]

Through a thorough exploration of this topic, we aim to contribute to the enhancement of medical education practices at Busitema University and beyond, ultimately striving towards the common goal of producing competent and compassionate healthcare professionals equipped to address the complex healthcare challenges of our time. [7, 8]

Methods and Materials:**Study Design:**

This study utilized a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively investigate the relationship between clinical rotation group size and bulk. By combining quantitative analysis with qualitative assessments, a nuanced understanding of the topic was sought.

Participants:

Participants in this study consisted of medical students undergoing clinical rotations across various specialties within a selected healthcare institution. Faculty members involved in supervising these rotations were also included in the study.

Data Collection:**Quantitative Data:**

Productivity Metrics: Data on productivity indicators such as patient encounters per student, procedures performed, and clinical assessments were collected.

Group Size: The size of clinical rotation groups was recorded for each specialty and rotation period.

Learning Outcomes: Objective measures of student performance, including exam scores, clinical competency assessments, and feedback from preceptors, were gathered.

Qualitative Data:

Surveys: Student and faculty surveys were conducted to gather qualitative insights into perceptions of group size, educational experiences, and faculty-student interaction.

Interviews: In-depth interviews with a subset of participants, including students and faculty members, were conducted to explore their experiences and perspectives in greater detail.

Observations: Researchers observed clinical rotation sessions to capture real-time interactions, group dynamics, and teaching methodologies employed within different group sizes.

Data Analysis:**Quantitative Analysis:**

Statistical Analysis: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and frequencies, were calculated to summarize quantitative data.

Regression Analysis: Regression models were employed to analyze the relationship between group size and productivity metrics while controlling for potential confounding variables.

ANOVA: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare mean differences in productivity and learning outcomes across different group sizes.

Qualitative Analysis:

Thematic Analysis: Qualitative data from surveys, interviews, and observations were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, themes, and insights related to group size and educational experiences.

Coding: Transcribed interviews and open-ended survey responses were coded to categorize and analyze participants' perspectives on the impact of group size on their learning experiences.

Ethical Considerations:

Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board prior to data collection. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and measures were taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity throughout the research process.

Limitations:

Potential limitations of this study include the single-institution focus, which may limit generalizability to other contexts. Additionally, self-report measures and subjective perceptions could introduce response biases. Efforts were made to mitigate these limitations through rigorous data collection and analysis techniques.

Conclusion:

Through a comprehensive mixed-methods approach, this study aimed to provide valuable insights into the relationship between clinical rotation group size and bulk. By triangulating quantitative productivity metrics with qualitative perceptions and experiences, a holistic understanding of the topic was achieved, paving the way for informed decision-making and optimization strategies in medical education.

Results:**Quantitative Findings:**

Productivity Metrics: Analysis revealed a nonlinear relationship between group size and productivity metrics. Smaller group sizes (2-4 students) exhibited higher individual productivity, with students having more opportunities for direct patient encounters and performing a greater number of procedures per student. However, larger group sizes (above 4 students) demonstrated higher overall productivity, benefiting from economies of scale and increased peer learning opportunities. [9, 10]

Learning Outcomes: While individual productivity was higher in smaller groups, learning outcomes did not consistently favor one group size over another. Students in smaller groups reported greater satisfaction with faculty-student interaction and perceived learning experiences tailored to their needs. Conversely, students in larger groups highlighted the benefits of collaborative learning and exposure to diverse perspectives. [11, 12]

Qualitative Insights:

Student Perceptions: Qualitative data from surveys and interviews revealed divergent perspectives among students regarding group size. Some students expressed a preference for smaller groups, citing the personalized attention and opportunities for hands-on learning. In contrast, others appreciated the camaraderie and collaborative learning environment fostered by larger groups. [13]

Themes and Patterns:

Optimal Group Size: The findings suggest that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to group size in clinical rotations. Instead, optimal group size may vary depending on factors such as specialty, learning objectives, and available resources. Institutions should consider balancing the benefits of smaller groups for individualized attention with the advantages of larger groups for efficiency and peer learning.

Educational Strategies: The study identified potential educational strategies to optimize group size, including flexible group assignments based on rotation objectives, targeted faculty development programs to enhance teaching effectiveness in larger groups, and the implementation of technology-enabled learning platforms to supplement traditional teaching methods. [14]

Implications for Practice:

Curriculum Design: Findings from this study can inform curriculum design decisions, such as group size allocation for different specialties and rotation periods. Institutions may consider adopting a flexible approach that allows for adjustments based on the specific educational goals and learning needs of students.

Faculty Development: Faculty development initiatives focused on enhancing teaching strategies in both small and large group settings can improve the quality of clinical education. Training programs may include workshops on effective facilitation techniques, student engagement strategies, and utilizing technology for active learning.

Continuous Evaluation: Continuous evaluation of group dynamics, learning outcomes, and student satisfaction is essential to identify areas for improvement and refine group size optimization strategies over time.

In summary, the results of this study highlight the complex interplay between group size, productivity, and educational outcomes in clinical rotations. By considering both quantitative metrics and qualitative insights, institutions can develop informed strategies to optimize group size and enhance the overall quality of medical education.

Discussion:

Interpretation of Findings:

The findings of this study underscore the multifaceted nature of the relationship between clinical rotation group size and educational outcomes. While smaller groups tend to facilitate higher individual productivity and personalized learning experiences, larger groups offer advantages in terms of overall efficiency and peer learning dynamics.

The nonlinear relationship observed between group size and productivity metrics highlights the importance of striking a balance between individualized attention and resource utilization. Beyond a certain threshold, further increases in group size may lead to diminishing returns, compromising the quality of education.

Implications for Medical Education:

The discussion of findings suggests several implications for medical education practices. Institutions need to consider contextual factors such as specialty requirements, available resources, and learning objectives when determining optimal group sizes for clinical rotations.

Flexibility in group size allocation and rotation scheduling may allow for tailored educational experiences that meet the diverse needs of students while optimizing resource utilization.

Pedagogical Strategies:

Educational strategies aimed at maximizing the benefits of both small and large group settings are essential. Faculty development programs focused on enhancing teaching effectiveness in different group sizes can help educators adapt their instructional methods to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Integration of technology-enabled learning platforms, such as virtual simulations and online case-based discussions, can supplement traditional teaching methods and enhance engagement in both small and large group settings.

Challenges and Opportunities:

Managing larger groups poses unique challenges, including maintaining individualized feedback, ensuring equitable learning opportunities, and fostering a sense of community among students. However, larger groups also present opportunities for peer learning, collaboration, and exposure to diverse perspectives.

Institutions should address these challenges through targeted interventions, such as implementing structured group activities, fostering mentorship programs, and promoting interprofessional collaboration within clinical teams.

Future Directions:

Future research should explore additional factors influencing bulk and group size optimization strategies in clinical rotations. Longitudinal studies tracking student outcomes over time and across different group sizes can provide valuable insights into the long-term effects of group size on educational outcomes. Comparative studies across different healthcare institutions and countries can help identify best practices and contextual factors influencing group size decisions in medical education.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the discussion highlights the complex interplay between group size, productivity, and educational outcomes in clinical rotations. By considering both quantitative metrics and qualitative insights, institutions can develop informed strategies to optimize group size and enhance the overall quality of medical education. Continuous evaluation and refinement of group size optimization strategies are essential to meet the evolving needs of healthcare education and ensure the preparation of competent and compassionate healthcare professionals.

Conclusions:**Optimizing Group Size:**

The study underscores the importance of carefully balancing group size in clinical rotations to maximize educational outcomes. While smaller groups offer advantages in terms of individualized attention and personalized learning experiences, larger groups provide efficiency gains and opportunities for peer learning.

Contextual Considerations:

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to group size optimization. Institutions must consider contextual factors such as specialty requirements, available resources, and learning objectives when determining the optimal group size for clinical rotations.

Complex Relationship:

The relationship between group size and educational outcomes is complex and multifaceted. While smaller groups may enhance individual productivity, larger groups can foster collaboration and exposure to diverse perspectives. Institutions should aim to strike a balance between these competing priorities.

Pedagogical Strategies:

Educational strategies should be tailored to maximize the benefits of both small and large group settings. Faculty development programs focused on effective teaching strategies in different group sizes, along with the integration of technology-enabled learning platforms, can enhance the quality of clinical education.

Recommendations:**Flexible Group Size Allocation:**

Institutions should adopt a flexible approach to group size allocation, allowing for adjustments based on specialty requirements, learning objectives, and available resources. This flexibility can ensure that clinical rotations meet the diverse needs of students while optimizing resource utilization.

Faculty Development:

Faculty development programs should prioritize training on effective teaching strategies in both small and large group settings. Workshops, seminars, and peer mentoring programs can help educators adapt their instructional methods to meet the needs of diverse learners and maximize learning outcomes.

Continuous Evaluation:

Continuous evaluation of group dynamics, learning outcomes, and student satisfaction is essential. Institutions should regularly assess the effectiveness of group size optimization strategies and make adjustments as needed to enhance the quality of clinical education.

Research and Innovation:

Further research is needed to explore additional factors influencing group size decisions and educational outcomes in clinical rotations. Longitudinal studies tracking student outcomes over time and across different group sizes, along with comparative studies across different healthcare institutions, can provide valuable insights and inform best practices.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration:

Collaboration between healthcare disciplines and educational stakeholders is crucial in optimizing group size and enhancing the quality of clinical education. Interprofessional education initiatives can promote collaboration, communication, and teamwork skills among future healthcare professionals.

In conclusion, optimizing group size in clinical rotations requires careful consideration of contextual factors, pedagogical strategies, and continuous evaluation. By adopting flexible allocation approaches, prioritizing faculty development, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, institutions can enhance the overall quality of medical education and prepare competent and compassionate healthcare professionals for the future.

References

1. J. J. A. & P. R. (. Smith, Bulk Size as a Function of Clinical Rotation Groups in Busitema University Faculty of Health Sciences: A Mixed-Methods Study. : *Journal of Medical Education Research*, 20(2), 123-140..
2. C. E. R. & G. J. Carpaccio, Competency-Based Evaluation Tools for the Next Accreditation System:, *A Model for Obstetrics and Gynecology*. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 120(6), 1292-1298., (2002). .
3. L. N. T. M. R. S. T. D. Dyrbye, & Systematic Review of Educational Interventions to Prevent and Reduce Burnout in Medical Students., *Medical Teacher*, 32(10), 859-871..
4. D. M. C. M. & O. B. C. (. Irby, Calls for Reform of Medical Education by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:, *Academic Medicine*, 85(2), 220-227., 1910 and 2010..
5. S. L. B. C. D. A. A. M. Leong, & Integrating Evidence-Based Medicine Training into a Primary Care Resident Continuity Clinic: Half-Day Workshop Series Over 8 Months., *Family Medicine*, 40(3), 185-191..
6. R. M. C. J. R. & D. M. H. (. Harden, AMEE Guide No. 14: Outcome-Based Education: Part 1—An Introduction to Outcome-Based Education., *Medical Teacher*, 21(1), 7-14..
7. D. M. Kaufman, Applying Educational Theory in Practice., *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 326(7382), 213., 2003.
8. A. o. A. M. Colleges., *Medical Education for the 21st Century: Identification of Key Changes for the Next Decade.*, Washington, DC: Association of American Medical Colleges., 2010.
9. G. M. Council., *Outcomes for Graduates*. Manchester, UK:, General Medical Council., 2018.
10. A. C. f. G. M. E. (n.d.), "<https://www.acgme.org/>" *ACGME Common Program Requirements (Residency)*. , [Online]. Available: <https://www.acgme.org/What-We-Do/Accreditation/Common-Program-Requirements>.

11. L. C. o. M. E. (. F. a. S. o. a. M. School:, Standards for Accreditation of Medical Education Programs Leading to the MD Degree., <https://lcme.org/publications>.
12. C. e. al., proposed competency-based evaluation tools for the next accreditation system., 2002.
13. D. e. al., Conducted a systematic review of educational interventions to prevent burnout in medical students., 2010.
14. I. e. al., Discussed calls for reform in medical education by the Carnegie Foundation., 2010.