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PROJECT DETAILED

Outputs: What has been produced thus far?

1. Ethical approval obtained,
2. Advice was sought from external advisor Prof Srikant Sarangi,
3. Analytical tool development finished,
4. First draft of Handbook finished,
5. First round of consultation finished.

Outcomes/Impact: To what extent are you achieving the original aims of the project? Please include examples where possible.

This project has two aims, namely, to develop an innovative analytical tool for learning and teaching clinical communication and to develop the e-learning package for learning to use the tool.

We have achieved the first aim so far by finishing the development of the tool and moved on to the second stage of consultation within the interdisciplinary team.

We have received first round of feedback from team members consisting of both clinical communication tutors, clinicians, medical students and language teacher. All of them recognise this tool as useful.

In order to raise people's awareness of the significance and pragmatic implications of this project, S Li has also organised two talks by Prof Srikant Sarangi and Prof John Skelton delivered in the Division of Medical Education and Department of Education and Professional Studies.
Supportive factors: What are the main factors that are contributing to the successful progress of the project?

1. Working as a team: the team have been meeting regularly throughout the process to discuss any new ideas and developments. We took into account everyone’s opinion and discussed discrepancies extensively.

2. Taking an interdisciplinary approach. Team members come from different academic and professional backgrounds. They have brought into this project paramount of knowledge that we cannot gather without them.

3. Project leader and the research assistant work closely to produce the handbook. S Li and RA ensured that they meet at least once a week to discuss contents development, format of the handbook, video analyses and the project progress in general.

4. Getting more people involved: no only do we have internal conversations but we also include people outside the team to get involved in the process. This helps us obtain different perspectives in developing the tool so far.

Challenges: Have you experienced any barriers or challenges in developing your project? What could be done to support innovation in the curriculum?

The biggest challenge we had experienced was the change of staff. The project manager and RA had to leave the team consecutively due to other commitment, cause disruption to the progression of the project. Also replacements were found as soon as possible we had lost some very precious time in between.

Due to the delay caused by the change of staff, we are slightly behind the schedule. We are just about to start the pre-intervention assessment in the next two week. We still need a few more weeks to finish video analysis before we can begin to develop the e-learning package. But we feel this should be expected and we are confident that once the content development is finished the e-learning development should be fairly quickly.
**Recommendations:** Based on your projects, what recommendations would you make for improving the curriculum and student experience generally? Are there any wider implications of your project for the College/University undergraduate and/or postgraduate curriculum? In particular what would be the implications of introducing your innovation on a large scale across a range of disciplines?

Teaching of clinical communication should also teach student how to analyse it because reflection (analysis) of self and other’s communication is the main ways of current teaching. This project provides a systematic way of analysing verbal interaction that is core to communication. It should be integrated into the core curriculum of clinical communication in undergraduate medicine. S Li is working closely with the General Practice department and colleagues over there are keen to integrate the outcome of the project into their training for GP trainers, who will then benefit our medical students. As the academic lead for clinical communication, S Li will propose changes to the curriculum upon the successful conclusion of the project.

S Li is planning to extend this project into a three year project to explore the ways to use this method in clinicians’ professional development and at the PG level clinical education. His Expression of Interest application to Guys and St Thomas Charity for funding has been approved. Now he is writing up the full application, for which he has had conversation with the dean of London Deanery and associate director who’s in charge of clinical communication training. Both of them expressed great interest in the project and are willing to support it.

Once this method is proved useful for medical students, we will seek opportunities to deliver it to other health schools, where students need to learn clinical communication.

**Dissemination:** Has the project been shared with colleagues within and beyond the institution yet? What are you plans to do so?

As mentioned in the previous question, this project has been shared with colleagues from both within KCL and beyond. We also have plan to publish the handbook by the end of the project. However, this may take a longer time to prepare and that may well be after the conclusion of the CTF project. However, the new funding S Li is seeking will enable it to happen.