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Optimization of the Resident Didactic Curriculum – High Yield, High Reward!

BACKGROUND
Didactic curriculum plays an integral role in the foundation of resident education. There are many barriers faced in the development of a curriculum that not only provides clinical relevance for daily practice, but also adequately prepares residents for the American Board of Pediatrics (ABP) certifying exam. These include ensuring lecture topics mirror the ABP learning objectives and that the material is covered within an allotted time frame.

PURPOSE
To develop a curriculum committee that ensures appropriate coverage of ABP learning objectives in a concise and timely manner within a curriculum that adequately prepares residents for their board examinations.

METHODS AND RESULTS
A committee of residents and faculty was formed to review the didactic lecture series and met quarterly to review resident feedback and provide lecturers with constructive feedback for future lectures. Lecturers were provided with specific ABP learning objectives in advance to help ensure presentations that were directed toward the specific objectives. Simultaneously, presenters were offered assistance from the Department of Education to review and optimize presentations. Lecture-specific ABP learning objectives were distributed to the residents prior to each didactic session. Written surveys were completed by the residents following each didactic session, both before and after interventions to 1 – evaluate whether ABP learning objectives were met (67% “yes” pre-intervention, 93% “yes” post-intervention (p=0.0619)) and 2 – if the lectures were completed within the allotted time (68% “yes” pre-intervention and 88% “yes” post-intervention (p=0.165). Additionally, an anonymous online survey was distributed 3 months post-intervention to residents. A 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree to strongly agree” was used to evaluate their sense of improvement in the lecture series including adherence to ABP learning objectives and time management.

CONCLUSIONS
Although still in the early phases of intervention, initial results show a positive impact on the didactic lecture series provided to residents, both in regards to appropriate coverage of ABP learning objectives and time efficiency.

Additional metrics will continue to be gathered including ITE scores and board pass rates after interventions have been in place for one year or more.