Facilitation of Learning (FoL) – ENPHE
Good Practice for Physiotherapy Education

1. **Title of the Good Practice + Author(s) + e-mail:**

Creating quality awareness for physiotherapeutic skills

Pauline Kneepkens-Jacobs, Fontys University of Applied Sciences

p.kneepkens@fontys.nl

2. **Background & Rationale:**

This good practice is applied in the context of formative skills assessment in physiotherapy bachelor education, where students are expected to acquire practical competencies. A recurring challenge observed in formative assessments is that students often ask, “But is it sufficient or insufficient, sir?” instead of engaging in meaningful reflection or giving high-quality peer feedback. Additionally, students tend to provide limited or superficial feedback, focus on performance rather than learning, and are often uncertain about what constitutes quality work.

The gap addressed by this practice is students’ lack of awareness of quality standards and the reasoning behind their actions. In physiotherapy, understanding *why* a technique or procedure is performed a certain way is critical for clinical reasoning, patient safety, and adaptation to diverse clinical situations. By having students create a single-point rubric before performing skills, they actively engage with quality criteria, deepen their understanding of assessment standards, and are better able to provide constructive peer feedback. This enhances learning beyond mere imitation of demonstrated skills.

The practice is grounded in formative assessment theory, particularly the cyclical model described by Gulikers & Baartman (2017) and Wiliam & Leahy (2019). A key principle is that students must first reflect on quality before meaningful feedback or learning actions can occur. The single-point rubric embodies this step, fostering metacognition, self-regulated learning, and peer-assisted learning. The approach also draws on the broader educational vision of moving from performance-focused learning to competency and reasoning-focused learning, where students internalize criteria of quality and actively engage in peer evaluation.

I categorise my case under the following theme (please tick the appropriate box):

☐ Clinical reasoning skills
■ Learning between students
☐ Simulation-based learning
■ Lack of motivation
☐ Tailored learning for student diversity
☐ Facilitation of online physiotherapy
■ Self-regulation in physiotherapy learning (professional issues)
☐ Blended learning strategies
☐ Other: .....

3. Learning Objectives:

Through this practice, students are expected to achieve:

1. Quality awareness – Ability to identify what constitutes high-quality performance in physiotherapy skills.
2. Peer feedback skills – Ability to give constructive, specific, and evidence-based feedback to peers.
3. Self-reflection and metacognition – Understanding why specific actions are performed and how to improve them.
4. Active engagement and accountability – Participation in learning and assessment as a co-creator of standards.
5. Clinical reasoning development – Connecting performance criteria with underlying principles of physiotherapy practice.

4. Implementation & Description of the Good Practice:

Practical sessions: Students apply the rubric during skills practice in laboratory or clinical simulation settings.

Peer feedback sessions: Conducted after demonstration, where students observe each other and provide feedback using the rubric.

Reflection activities: Students discuss the rationale behind their decisions and identify areas for improvement.

Assessments: Primarily formative, integrated before summative evaluations to enhance learning readiness.

Potential barriers: Time constraints in practical sessions. Unfamiliarity of the institute with the approach.

Step by step approach:

- **Demonstration**: A student or the instructor performs the skill for students to observe.
- **Student rubric creation**: Students create a single-point rubric, defining what a "satisfactory" performance looks like for the skill.
- **Discussion and reflection**: Groups discuss their rubric, reconcile differences, and reflect on the rationale behind the criteria.
- **Observation and peer feedback**: Students observe peers performing the skill, using the rubric to note strengths and areas for improvement.
- **Discussion and reflection**: Groups discuss their observations, reconcile differences, and reflect on the rationale behind the criteria.
- **Iteration and skill practice**: Students repeat the skill with feedback in mind, refining performance and reasoning.

5. **Evaluation & Feedback:**

Feedback is primarily formative, focusing on skill improvement and understanding of quality. Peer-to-peer feedback guided by the rubric, supplemented by instructor observation and discussion.

6. **Challenges & Solutions:**

Effectiveness is evaluated via:

- Student engagement and participation during practical sessions.
- Observation within institute: noting richer, more detailed feedback and increased number of students involved in peer feedback.
- Quality of peer feedback: more specific, evidence-based, and actionable compared to prior formative tests.
- Behavioral indicators: less focus on "is it sufficient?" questions and more focus on learning and understanding rationale.

7. **Impact & Sustainability**

Students focus on understanding and reasoning rather than mere performance. They also develop competencies that transfer to clinical placements and interprofessional settings. And it can be applied repeatedly across skills, modules, and cohorts.

8. **References & Supporting Materials:**

Wiliam, D., & Leahy, S. (2019). *Embedding formative assessment: Practical techniques for K-12 classrooms* (Schoemaker, Trans., 2nd ed.). Rotterdam: Bazalt Educatieve Uitgaven.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487

Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37(1), 3-14.

If you have any questions about the template, please email: Matthias.eggermont@vub.be

Thank you in advance for completing the template and for your valuable input.

Niki Stolwijk, Anke van Erp, Livia Hoeben en Matthias Eggermont