

i The Alliance for Academic Internal Medicine Faculty Development Toolbox provides peer-reviewed tools to enhance faculty written qualitative feedback and assessment of learners.

For a complete list of resources, visit www.im.org/qualfeedback

Title: Providing Structure to Written Qualitative Feedback: The BOSS Framework

Member Contact: Bharat Kumar **Email:** Bharat-Kumar@Ulowa.edu **Institution/Title:** University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics

Brief Description: This guide is intended to help physicians who are clinical educators to provide specific behaviorally-oriented written feedback to resident and fellow physicians.

Learning Objectives (please provide at least two learning objective):

- **Recognize** the components of effective written qualitative feedback
- **Develop** statements for written feedback using the BOSS method (Brief Observation, Significance, and Suggestions)
- **Assess** the quality of written feedback based on the opinions of learners

Equipment Required: Computer with Microsoft Powerpoint, Black ink printer for handouts **Setting:** Small or large group classroom setting

Total preparation time: 30 minutes **Total time commitment for learner:** 30 minutes

Ideal audience size: 10-50 people

Is activity a one-time activity or a series of activities: One-time activity

Intended Faculty Audience:

• Community Faculty	• University Faculty
• Volunteer Faculty	• Hospitalist
• General Internist	• Specialist
• New Faculty	• Experienced Faculty
• Outpatient Faculty	• Inpatient Faculty
Comments: This curriculum was evaluated in a single institution fellowship program.	

Delivery Type

- **Didactic training**
- Self-directed
- One-on-one coaching
- Other (please describe): _____

PREPARATION

Desired Background/Qualifications for Instructor or Facilitator: Facilitator should have at least one year of experience as clinical faculty who has provided qualitative written evaluations. She or he needs to be proficient in written and spoken English and be able to operate a computer.

Preparatory Steps

Preparations and Considerations	Description
1.	One month prior to the conference, request the program administrator compile a report of each faculty member's comments on learner performance from the previous six months. This report should de-identify the learners and evaluators.
2.	These comments should be randomized by the facilitator and divided by the number of expected faculty members who will be attending the conference
3.	The facilitator should enter each of these comments into the BOSS template (attached)
4.	One week prior to the conference, the facilitator should review the reference articles below
5.	

ACTIVITY

Based on the delivery mode(s) selected above, complete the following table(s) below

Didactic Training

Steps	Description	Estimated Time	Slide Number
1	Welcome participants and state her/his disclosures	1 minute	#1-2
2	About the Facilitator, stating her/his qualifications	1 minute	#3
3	Review the learning objectives	1 minute	#4
4	Brief introduction into the importance of written feedback	1 minute	#5
5	Distribution of the self-assessment prior to the activity (using attached Script Concordance Test)	5 minutes	#6-8
6	Overview of the BOSS Method	4 minutes	#9
7	Overview of Brief Observation	2 minutes	#11
8	Distinction between judgement and observation	1 minute	#12
9	Examples of Judgments and Observations	2 minutes	#13
10	Overview of Significance	1 minute	#15
11	Distinction of significance for learners vs. for evaluators	1 minute	#16
12	Examples of Differing Significances	2 minutes	#17

	Overview of Suggestions	2 minute	#19
13	Suggestions for providing suggestions	1 minute	#20
14	Examples of Suggestions	2 minutes	#21
15	Demonstration of example of how to write written qualitative feedback using the BOSS Method	3 minutes	#22
16	Pause to ask questions	1-5 minutes	#23
17	Exercises to convert existing comments to BOSS-style comments	10 minutes	#24
18	Debriefing to discuss collectively how they converted these comments	10 minutes	#26
19	Self-assessment post-activity (using the attached Script Concordance Test)	5-10 minutes	#27-28
20	Wrap Up	1-5 minutes	#29-30
Total		56-70 minutes	30 slides

FOLLOW UP

Didactic Training

Steps	Description	Estimated Time
Evaluation and Assessment	1) Evaluation via Script Concordance Pre- and Post-Activity Self-Assessments 2) Survey/Questionnaire (attached)	5 minute pre-activity; 5 minute post-activity; 1 minute survey
Dissemination of Results	One week after the activity, the facilitator will e-mail the sample statistics (mean, median, standard deviation) to the participants	N/A

EVALUATION AND OUTCOMES

Source	Description
Comparison of unstructured vs. structured BOSS-style written evaluations	<p>6 rheumatology fellows were surveyed regarding qualitative feedback over the past 3-6 months. They were provided written statements as part of qualitative written evaluations from clinical assignments. Half of these were in an unstructured format while half were in the structured (BOSS) format. They were queried about whether they (1) recalled receiving such feedback, (2) how they incorporated each comment into their practice, and (3) considered the feedback to be high or low quality using a 5-point Likert Scale.</p> <p>Thirty comments were provided to each fellow (180 total). Fellows were more likely to recall comments when provided in a structured manner (72% vs. 54%) and were more likely to incorporate written</p>

	feedback into their practice (63% vs. 42%). BOSS-style comments were more likely to be rated as higher quality (4.3) compared to unstructured comments (2.5). [Unpublished Data]
Evaluation of Script Concordance Test	20 representative comments were placed as items for a script concordance test. 12 current and recently graduated fellow physicians answered these items using the rubric in the attached word document. After two rounds of discussion, there was a high rate of agreement between the 12 fellow physicians (19 of 20 had full agreement of all 12). This forms the basis of the pre- and post-activity script concordance self-assessments.

FURTHER STUDY/REFERENCES:

Voyer S, Cuncic C, Butler DL, et al. Investigating conditions for meaningful feedback in the context of an evidence-based feedback programme. *Med Educ.* 2016 Sep;50(9):943-54. doi: 10.1111/medu.13067.

Shaughness G, Georgoff PE, Sandhu G, et al. Assessment of clinical feedback given to medical students via an electronic feedback system. *J Surg Res.* 2017 Oct;218:174-179.

Georgoff PE, Shaughness G, Leininger L, et al. Evaluating the performance of the Minute Feedback System: A web-based feedback tool for medical students. *Am J Surg.* 2018 Feb;215(2):293-297.