

Viewpoint

Redefining Bioethics Education: The Role of Workplace-Based Assessments

Russell Franco D'Souza^{1,2}, Mary Mathew³, Krishna Mohan Surapaneni^{4,5*}

¹Department of Education, UNESCO Chair in Bioethics, Melbourne, Australia.

²International Institute of Organizational Psychological Medicine, 71 Cleeland Street, Dandenong Victoria, Melbourne, 3175 Australia.

³Department of Pathology, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Manipal Academy of Higher Education (MAHE), Tiger Circle Road, Madhav Nagar, Manipal, Karnataka.

⁴Department of Biochemistry, Panimalar Medical College Hospital & Research Institute, Varadharajapuram, Poonamallee, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

⁵Department of Medical Education, Panimalar Medical College Hospital & Research Institute, Varadharajapuram, Poonamallee, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Corresponding Author: Krishna Mohan Surapaneni

E-mail: krishnamohan.surapaneni@gmail.com

Bioethics lies at the very heart of healthcare, guiding professionals in navigating the moral and ethical challenges that are intrinsic to clinical practice and research. As the healthcare landscape becomes increasingly complex, the need for robust bioethics education has grown [1]. However, traditional methods of teaching and assessment often fail to prepare students for the realities of ethical decision-making in fast-paced, high-pressure environments. One promising solution lies in workplace-based assessments (WBAs), a method that evaluates students in real-world settings, fostering the application of ethical principles directly in the context where they are most needed [2].

Bioethics is not just about understanding theoretical concepts or memorizing principles; it is about the practical application of these principles in situations fraught with ambiguity and tension. From managing end-of-life decisions to handling patient confidentiality in the face of external pressures, healthcare professionals face ethical dilemmas that require quick, thoughtful, and compassionate responses [3]. While classroom-based assessments can measure knowledge, they fall short in capturing the dynamic and situational nature of ethical reasoning. WBAs bridge this gap by providing a platform to observe, evaluate, and guide learners as they apply bioethical principles in real-time clinical settings [4].

At its core, workplace-based assessment integrates the learning and evaluation of bioethics into the fabric of clinical practice. WBAs use tools such as direct observation, reflective practice, case discussions, and multisource feedback to assess how learners approach and resolve ethical challenges [5]. Unlike theoretical exams, WBAs provide a window into how students and trainees engage with ethical dilemmas as they unfold. For example, a student may be observed explaining a challenging diagnosis to a patient, ensuring informed consent while balancing empathy and clarity. This direct observation allows educators to assess not only the student's knowledge but also their communication skills, emotional intelligence, and ability to navigate the ethical intricacies of the situation.

One of the most valuable tools in WBAs is the mini-clinical evaluation exercise (mini-CEX). In this format, a supervisor observes a specific clinical interaction and provides immediate feedback. For instance, a mini-CEX in bioethics might involve a trainee managing a situation where family members request that a patient not be informed of a terminal diagnosis [6]. The evaluator would assess how the trainee balances respect for the family's concerns with the patient's right to autonomy and truth. By providing real-time feedback, the mini-CEX helps learners identify areas for improvement and reinforces the importance of ethical practice in patient care [7].

Case-based discussions (CbDs) are another critical component of WBAs in bioethics. These discussions allow students and supervisors to reflect on cases where ethical dilemmas played a significant role [8]. For example, a CbD might explore a case where a limited number of ICU beds forced difficult decisions about patient prioritization. These structured discussions not only assess the learner's reasoning and decision-making process but also provide an opportunity for deeper exploration of ethical principles and their practical implications. CbDs foster critical thinking and help learners appreciate the broader context of their decisions, such as policy constraints and cultural considerations [9].

Multisource feedback (MSF) brings an additional layer of depth to WBAs by incorporating perspectives from a range of individuals who interact with the learner, including peers, nurses, patients, and supervisors. In bioethics, MSF can be invaluable for assessing interpersonal and communication skills, which are critical for ethical practice [10]. For instance, feedback from a nurse might highlight how well a trainee explained a do-not-resuscitate (DNR) order to a patient's family, while feedback from peers could reveal strengths or gaps in collaborative decision-making. This 360-degree approach ensures that ethical competencies are evaluated from multiple viewpoints, offering a comprehensive picture of the learner's performance.

Reflective practice is another cornerstone of WBAs in bioethics. Encouraging students to reflect on their experiences, decisions, and the outcomes of their actions helps them internalize ethical principles and grow as practitioners [11]. Journals or portfolios can be used to document these reflections, capturing the learner's thought processes and the evolution of their ethical reasoning. For instance, a trainee might write about a time they struggled to navigate a disagreement between a patient's wishes and their family's demands, exploring how they approached the situation and what they learned from the experience. This self-assessment not only deepens understanding but also fosters a commitment to lifelong ethical learning [12].

The integration of WBAs into bioethics education is not without its challenges. One significant hurdle is ensuring that educators are equipped to conduct these assessments effectively. WBAs require supervisors to be skilled in observing behavior, providing constructive feedback, and facilitating reflective discussions [13]. Institutions must invest in training programs that prepare faculty to carry out WBAs with rigor and consistency.

Another challenge lies in balancing the demands of clinical practice with the time-intensive nature of WBAs. Supervisors and trainees often operate under significant time pressures, making it difficult to prioritize detailed observations and feedback sessions [14]. Creative scheduling and institutional support are critical to ensuring that WBAs can be conducted without compromising the quality of care or education.

Despite these challenges, the benefits of WBAs in bioethics education are undeniable. By embedding assessment into the clinical environment, WBAs provide a more authentic and meaningful evaluation of ethical competencies [15]. They help learners bridge the gap between knowledge and action, ensuring that ethical principles are not just understood but also practiced. Additionally, WBAs promote a culture of continuous feedback and improvement, encouraging learners to view ethical practice as an ongoing journey rather than a static skill.

The future of WBAs in bioethics lies in leveraging technology to enhance their implementation. Digital platforms can streamline the documentation and feedback process, making it easier for supervisors to record observations and provide actionable insights [16]. Collaboration among institutions will also be key to advancing WBAs in bioethics. By sharing best practices, case scenarios, and assessment tools, educators can build a unified framework that ensures consistency and excellence in bioethics education across different settings [17]. Research into the effectiveness of WBAs will further strengthen their role, providing evidence of their impact on learner outcomes and patient care.

Incorporating WBAs into bioethics education represents a paradigm shift, moving away from abstract, classroom-based assessments toward evaluations rooted in the realities of clinical practice. It is a shift that acknowledges the dynamic and context-dependent nature of ethical decision-making and prepares learners to navigate the challenges of modern healthcare with confidence and integrity [18]. By fostering the application of ethical principles where they matter

most in the workplace WBAs ensure that the next generation of healthcare professionals is not only competent but also compassionate and morally grounded.

This commitment to workplace-based assessments is not merely an enhancement of current practices; it is a necessary evolution. The complexity of ethical dilemmas in healthcare demands that we prepare students to think, act, and reflect in real-world settings. WBAs are a powerful tool in this effort, providing a holistic and practical approach to bioethics education that bridges the gap between theory and practice. In doing so, they not only strengthen the ethical fabric of individual practitioners but also contribute to the collective integrity of the healthcare profession.

REFERENCES

1. Avci E. Evaluating the effectiveness of bioethics education through quality standards and indicators. *Int j Ethics Educ* 2022;7(1):5-19.
2. Nunes R, Duarte I, Santos C, Rego G. Education for values and bioethics. *Springer Plus* 2015;4:1-8.
3. Martins V, Santos C, Duarte I. Bioethics education and the development of nursing students' moral competence. *Nurse Educ Today* 2020;95:104601.
4. Miller A, Archer J. Impact of workplace based assessment on doctors' education and performance: a systematic review. *BMJ* 2010;341.
5. Norcini J, Burch V. Workplace-based assessment as an educational tool: AMEE Guide No. 31. *Med Teacher* 2007;29(9-10):855-71.
6. Guraya SY. Workplace-based assessment; applications and educational impact. *Malaysian J Med Sci* 2015;22(6):5.
7. Moonen-van Loon JMW, Overeem K, Donkers HJLM, Van der Vleuten CPM, Driessen EW. Composite reliability of a workplace-based assessment toolbox for postgraduate medical education. *Adv Health Sci Educ* 2008;18:1087-102.
8. Murphy DJ, Bruce DA, Mercer SW, Eva KW. The reliability of workplace-based assessment in postgraduate medical education and training: a national evaluation in general practice in the United Kingdom. *Adv Health Sci Educ* 2009;14:219-32.
9. Govaerts M. Workplace-based assessment and assessment for learning: threats to validity. *J Grad Med Educ* 2015;7(2):265-7.
10. Massie J, Ali JM. Workplace-based assessment: a review of user perceptions and strategies to address the identified shortcomings. *Adv Health Sci Educ* 2007;21:455-73.
11. Weller JM, Coomber T, Chen Y, Castanelli DJ. Key dimensions of innovations in workplace-based assessment for postgraduate medical education: a scoping review. *Br J Anaesth* 2021;127(5):689-703.
12. Emke AR, Park YS, Srinivasan S, Tekian A. Workplace-based assessments using pediatric critical care entrustable professional activities. *J Grad Med Educ* 2019;11(4):430-8.
13. Pauls MA, Ackroyd-Stolarz S. Identifying bioethics learning needs: a survey of Canadian emergency medicine residents. *Acad Emerg Med* 2006;13(6):645-52.
14. Eckles RE, Meslin EM, Gaffney M, Helft PR. Medical ethics education: where are we? Where should we be going? A review. *Acad Med* 2005;80(12):1143-52.
15. Anderson HL, Kurtz J, West DC. Implementation and use of workplace-based assessment in clinical learning environments: a scoping review. *Acad Med* 2021;96(11S):S164-74.
16. Beard J. Workplace-based assessment: the need for continued evaluation and refinement. *The Surgeon* 2011;9:S12-3.
17. Beard J, Bussey M. Workplace-based assessment. *Bull Royal Coll Surg Engl* 2022;89(5):158-60.
18. Crossley J, Johnson G, Booth J, Wade W. Good questions, good answers: construct alignment improves the performance of workplace-based assessment scales. *Med Educ* 2011;45(6):560-9.

Funding: None
Conflict of interest: Nil
Acknowledgements: Nil