

Implementation of Curriculum Strategies For Medical Education

Emeritus Prof. Ibrahim Betelmal¹, Dr. Suad Alnasfi²

Editor Letter

- 1.Advisor to the vice president of the University of Benghazi for medical Faculties, Former WHO Official.
- 2.Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Benghazi- Faculty of Medicine.

Copyright©2024University of Benghazi.

This open Access article is Distributed under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

Respected Sir/Madam:

In a world where medical knowledge is expanding, how we teach physicians is as important as what we teach. An integrated curriculum can bridge basic sciences and clinical practice and help develop soft skills such as critical thinking. By integrating disciplines, we prepare future doctors to address the challenges of modern healthcare systems.

Traditional medical education dates back to the early practices of apprenticeship models in the 18th and 19th centuries, where students learned by observing physicians. Over time, formalized medical schools emerged, notably influenced by European institutions. By the early 20th century, the Flexner Report (1910) significantly reshaped medical education in North America, advocating for a science-based curriculum. This model became the gold standard, dividing medical education into two distinct phases:

- 1.Pre-clinical Phase – Focus on basic sciences (anatomy, physiology, biochemistry).
- 2.Clinical Phase – Hospital-based rotations emphasizing practical skills.

While the traditional approach contributed to standardized medical training, it revealed several shortcomings over time:

- 1.Fragmentation of Knowledge: Basic sciences were taught in isolation from clinical practice, making it difficult for students to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world settings. This compartmentalization often led to a disconnect between classroom learning and patient care.
- 2.Delayed Patient Interaction: Clinical exposure was postponed for years, limiting early hands-on experience and reducing opportunities to develop essential communication and diagnostic skills
- 3.Passive Learning: The reliance on lectures and rote memorization led to passive learning, which hindered critical thinking and problem-solving skills.Problem-based learning (PBL) emerged in the late 1960s at McMaster University (Canada) as a response to the rigid and compartmentalized traditional medical curriculum. Educators sought to create a more dynamic, student-centered approach that emphasized critical thinking and real-world application. Students work in small groups to solve

clinical problems or cases. Facilitators guide discussions, but students drive the learning process by identifying knowledge gaps and researching solutions independently. Challenges associated with Problem-Based Learning (PBL) include:

1. Time-Consuming: PBL frequently necessitates substantial time for both preparation and group discussions, potentially restricting the depth of material covered
2. Variable Faculty Expertise: Facilitators must possess the ability to guide discussions without dominating them, which can be challenging without adequate training.
3. Assessment Difficulties: Evaluating student performance in group settings can be subjective and inconsistent.
4. Resource Intensive: PBL requires smaller class sizes, additional facilitators, and dedicated resources, which can strain institutional budgets.

Case-based learning (CBL) serves as a bridge between traditional and problem-based learning models, emphasizing structured clinical cases to contextualize theoretical knowledge. It gained prominence in the 1990s as an enhancement to problem-based learning (PBL). Students analyze real or simulated clinical cases to apply theoretical concepts. Faculty facilitate discussions, guiding students as they progressively explore more complex cases as their knowledge expands.

Challenges to CBL:

1. Limited Scope: Cases may not cover all aspects of a subject, leaving knowledge

gaps.

2. Facilitator-Dependent: The quality of learning heavily relies on the expertise and engagement of the faculty.
3. Engagement Variability: Some students may passively participate, limiting the full benefits of collaborative case exploration.
4. Difficulty Scaling: Large student cohorts can make case discussions less interactive and personal.

Team-based learning (TBL) originated in business education during the 1970s and subsequently gained adoption in medical education as a means of fostering collaboration and accountability. It experienced significant growth in the early 2000s as a scalable and cost-effective alternative to Problem-Based Learning (PBL). In TBL, students are divided into teams and engage in collaborative problem-solving or case analysis. Sessions typically encompass pre-class preparation, individual and team quizzes, and group applications of acquired knowledge.

Challenges to TBL include:

1. Dominance of Stronger Students: More vocal or knowledgeable students may dominate discussions, limiting engagement from quieter members.
2. Pre-Class Workload: TBL requires significant preparatory work, and unprepared students can hinder team progress.
3. Resistance to Group Work: Some students prefer independent learning and may find teamwork frustrating or inefficient.
4. Assessment Challenges: Balancing indi-



vidual and group performance assessments can be complex and sometimes perceived as unfair.

Integrated Learning began to gain prominence in medical education in the late 20th century as educators recognized the limitations of traditional teaching. This approach aims to connect basic sciences and clinical practice. Integrated learning is categorized into three types:

1- Horizontal Integration: Combines subjects within the same phase of education, such as anatomy and pathology in preclinical years.

2- Vertical Integration: Bridges preclinical and clinical phases, allowing students to apply basic science knowledge during clinical rotations.

3- Spiral Integration: Revisits and reinforces concepts at increasing levels of complexity throughout the curriculum, ensuring deeper learning over time.

The number and structure of modules in medical education vary depending on the institution, curriculum design, and their specific approach. However, most medical schools organize their programs into 8 to 12 major modules over preclinical and clinical years. These modules often follow an organ-system or thematic approach. Organ-system-based modules include the Cardiovascular System, Respiratory System, etc. Life-stage modules include Embryology, Pediatrics, and Geriatrics.

Challenges in Implementing Integrated Learning:

Integrated learning, which blends disciplines and connects theoretical knowledge with practical application, holds significant potential for enhancing educational outcomes. Research supports its effectiveness in fostering critical thinking and improving retention (Harden, 2000; Prince, 2004). However, its implementation poses several challenges that must be carefully addressed to ensure success. Key factors include faculty development, curriculum redesign, and resource allocation.

1. Faculty Development:

One of the primary challenges lies in preparing faculty to adopt integrated learning methodologies. Many educators are specialists in their respective fields, and transitioning to an interdisciplinary teaching model may require extensive professional development. Faculty must not only broaden their expertise but also collaborate across departments, which can be time-consuming and demanding. Additionally, there may be resistance to change, as some faculty members might prefer traditional teaching approaches (Cannon & Newble, 2000).

Solutions and Recommendations:

1. Provide regular workshops and training programs to enhance interdisciplinary teaching skills.
2. Establish mentorship programs where experienced faculty in integrated learning mentor others.
3. Encourage faculty exchange programs or collaborative teaching assignments across departments.



4. Create incentives for faculty to participate in curriculum innovation and integrated course design.

2. Curriculum Redesign:

Integrated learning necessitates significant changes to existing curricula. Designing courses that blend multiple subjects while maintaining academic rigor and coherence is complex. Institutions must ensure that learning objectives from various disciplines align and complement each other. This often involves restructuring course sequences, introducing new assessment methods, and creating interdisciplinary capstone projects (Cooke, Irby, & O'Brien, 2010). Achieving such alignment requires continuous dialogue and cooperation among faculty from different departments, which can be challenging to coordinate.

Solutions and Recommendations:

1. Form interdisciplinary curriculum committees to oversee course design and ensure coherence.

2. Pilot integrated learning modules before full-scale implementation to gather feedback and refine the approach.

3. Develop thematic, case-based, or project-based courses that naturally integrate multiple disciplines.

4. Utilize technology to create virtual learning environments that support cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Examples of Successful Models:

Several medical schools have successfully implemented integrated learning models.

For example:

1. Harvard Medical School employs a Pathways curriculum that integrates basic science with clinical experience early in the program. This approach helps students apply foundational knowledge in real-world settings from the outset (Tosteson, Adelstein, & Carver, 1994).

2. Duke University School of Medicine compresses the traditional pre-clinical curriculum into one year, allowing students to engage in research and advanced clinical experiences earlier (Bridges et al., 2011).

3. McMaster University's Michael G. DeGroote School of Medicine uses problem-based learning (PBL), where students work collaboratively on clinical cases from day one, fostering an integrated and practical approach to medical education (Neville, Norman, & Whitehead, 2011).

4. University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) follows the Bridges Curriculum, which emphasizes the continuous integration of scientific knowledge with clinical practice and interprofessional collaboration (Wartman, 2015).

3. Resource Allocation:

Implementing integrated learning often requires substantial financial and administrative resources. Institutions may need to invest in new technology, learning spaces, and teaching materials that support interdisciplinary approaches. Furthermore, additional staff or coordinators may be necessary to facilitate cross-departmental initiatives. Without adequate funding and institutional support, the sustainability of



integrated learning programs may be jeopardized (Gibbs, 2010).

Solutions and Recommendations:

1. Seek external funding through grants and partnerships with industry and government bodies.
2. Allocate dedicated budget lines for curriculum development and interdisciplinary projects.
3. Repurpose existing resources and spaces to foster collaborative learning environments.
4. Develop cost-effective digital tools and platforms that support integrated learning.

4. Student Adaptation and Engagement:

While integrated learning can be enriching, it may also pose difficulties for students accustomed to compartmentalized education. The shift to interconnected learning models may initially be confusing or overwhelming. Institutions must provide clear guidance and support to help students navigate integrated curricula. Ensuring that students appreciate the relevance and applicability of integrated learning to real-world scenarios is essential for maintaining engagement (Schmidt, 1998).

Solutions and Recommendations:

1. Implement orientation sessions to introduce students to the principles and benefits of integrated learning.
2. Develop student support services, such as tutoring and advising, focused on interdisciplinary education.
3. Encourage peer collaboration and group projects to build comfort with cross-disciplinary work

plinary work

4. Highlight successful alumni who have benefited from integrated learning models.

5. Assessment and Evaluation:

Evaluating student performance in integrated learning environments can be challenging. Traditional grading methods may not effectively capture interdisciplinary competencies or collaborative skills. Institutions must develop comprehensive assessment frameworks that account for teamwork, critical thinking, and the ability to synthesize knowledge from multiple disciplines. This may include project-based assessments, portfolios, peer evaluations, and reflective writing assignments. Rubrics that clearly define the criteria for interdisciplinary understanding and problem-solving can help provide more accurate evaluations (Harden & Gleeson, 1979). Additionally, continuous feedback loops, where students receive regular input on their progress, foster deeper learning and allow for ongoing improvement.

Solutions and Recommendations:

1. Develop new grading rubrics that emphasize interdisciplinary skills, problem-solving, and collaboration.
2. Incorporate formative assessments, such as reflective journals or group presentations, into the curriculum.
3. Use technology to track and evaluate student progress across multiple subjects.
4. Implement 360-degree assessments where feedback is gathered from peers, instructors, and self-reflection.



Conclusion:

Despite these challenges, the benefits of integrated learning—including enhanced critical thinking, problem-solving abilities, and real-world application of knowledge—make it a valuable educational model. By investing in faculty development, thoughtfully redesigning curricula, and ensuring proper resource allocation, institutions can overcome barriers and successfully implement integrated learning programs.

It's time for medical education to move away from rigid, compartmentalized approaches and adopt dynamic strategies that reflect the interconnected nature of medicine. Our healthcare systems depend on well-rounded physicians who are equipped with not only medical knowledge but also the ability to apply it effectively in diverse scenarios.

Sincerely,

References:

- 1-Bridges, S. M., Yiu, C. K. Y., & Botelho, M. G. (2011). Educational Strategies in Problem-Based Learning. *Medical Teacher*, 33(4), 320-328.
- 2- Cannon, R., & Newble, D. (2000). *A Handbook for Teachers in Universities and Colleges: A Guide to Improving Teaching Methods*. Routledge.
- 3- Cooke, M., Irby, D. M., & O'Brien, B. C. (2010). *Educating Physicians: A Call for Reform of Medical School and Residency*. Jossey-Bass.
- 4-Gibbs, G. (2010). *Dimensions of Quality*. Higher Education Academy.

- 5-Harden, R. M. (2000). The Integration Ladder: A Tool for Curriculum Planning and Evaluation. *Medical Education*, 34(7), 551-557.
- 6-Neville, A. J., Norman, G. R., & Whitehead, C. R. (2011). The Status of PBL Research: Where Are We Now?. *Medical Education*, 45(9), 912-922.
- 7-Prince, M. (2004). Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223-231.
- 8-Schmidt, H. G. (1998). Problem-Based Learning: Does It Prepare Medical Students to Become Better Doctors?. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 168(9), 429-432.