

1 **Title**

2 **Effectiveness of the EPA-based ‘Toolbox Family Medicine’ on students’**  
3 **learning satisfaction: study protocol for a controlled trial**

4  
5  
6 **Names protocol contributors**

7 Nicola Amarell, Maximilian Wehner, Johanna Schroeder, Dorothea Wild, Thomas

8 Welchowski, Birgitta Weltermann

9  
10 Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine

11 University of Bonn

12 Venusberg-Campus 1

13 53127 Bonn, Germany

14  
15 Nicola.Amarell@ukbonn.de

16 Maximilian.Wehner@ukbonn.de (Corresponding Author)

17 Johanna.Schroeder@ukbonn.de

18 Dorothea.Wild@ukbonn.de

19 Welchow@imbie.meb.uni-bonn.de

20 Birgitta.Weltermann@ukbonn.de

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Family practices constitute an important learning environment for medical  
25 students. However, teaching situations markedly vary between practices, and students  
26 frequently find rotations underwhelming. Especially, students' active participation in patient  
27 care varies profoundly, although it has a significant impact on students' interest in primary  
28 care careers. To standardize and improve learning situations in practices, we developed the  
29 so-called 'Toolbox Family Medicine (TFM)' using the concept of entrustable professional  
30 activities. It provides standardized learning content appropriate for students' levels and  
31 allows teaching adaptable to actual practice conditions.

32 **Methods:** Using a controlled trial with a waiting list control arm, we will evaluate the  
33 effectiveness of the toolbox on students' learning satisfaction. A total of 94 students will be  
34 allocated 1:1 to intervention and control practices. The teaching concept ‘Toolbox Family  
35 Medicine (TFM)’ comprises a didactic workshop for supervising physicians and a toolbox  
36 with practice-specific tasks for medical students. The primary outcome is students' overall  
37 satisfaction with their learning progress after the rotation. Secondary outcomes include the  
38 kind and number of tasks performed, the entrusted level per task, the feasibility of  
39 implementing the toolbox in actual practice settings, and students' motivation to pursue a  
40 career in primary care.

41 **Discussion:** We assume an improvement in learning satisfaction with the intervention. The  
42 study will begin with the next practice rotations.

43 **Keywords**

44 Family medicine, general practice rotation, clerkship, medical student, undergraduate  
45 medical education, primary care, faculty development, entrustable professional activities.

46

47

48 **Administrative information**

49

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Title {1}   | Effectiveness of the EPA-based ‘Toolbox Family Medicine’ on students’ learning satisfaction: study protocol for a controlled trial   |
| Trial registration {2a and 2b}.                         | The Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn deemed the study exempt from ethical review (August 26, 2021).   |
| Protocol version {3}                                    | Study protocol Version 1.0   |
| Funding {4}   | The study is financed by the Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine, University of Bonn, Germany. The study conduct is supported by the Program for Teaching Quality of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn by funding a student research assistant.  |
| Author details {5a}                                     | Nicola Amarell, M.D.<br>Maximilian Wehner, M.D.<br>Johanna Schroeder, M.D.<br>Dorothea Wild, M.D., MPH(USA)<br>Thomas Welchowski, PhD<br>Birgitta Weltermann, Prof., M.D., MPH(USA)<br><br>Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine,<br>Medical Faculty, University of Bonn,<br>Venusberg-Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany |
| Name and contact information for the trial sponsor {5b} | Supported by a restricted grant from the Program for Teaching Quality of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn, Germany.   |
| Role of sponsor {5c}                                    | The sponsor has no influence on any part of the study.   |

50

51

## 52 **Background**

### 53 **Background and rationale {6a}**

54 Family practices constitute an important learning environment for medical students  
55 (Pershing et al., 2013). However, practice rotations are heterogeneous teaching situations  
56 that students often find underwhelming (Herwig et al., 2017). The extent of students'  
57 participation varies considerably, although it significantly affects students' interest in primary  
58 care careers (Herwig et al., 2017). There are several reasons for unsatisfactory practice  
59 rotations: Supervising physicians balance competing tasks as they provide teaching  
60 integrated into their daily patient services. In addition, time pressure and lack of didactic  
61 training impair teaching quality.

62

63 Aiming at a better and more standardized learning environment in family practices, we  
64 developed the so-called 'Toolbox Family Medicine' (TFM). It provides standardized learning  
65 content suitable for students' levels and allows teaching adaptable to actual practice  
66 conditions. Learning content is structured following the concept of entrustable professional  
67 activities (EPA). All EPAs describe small tasks typical for routine primary care that students  
68 have to perform guided by the respective teaching physician (Ten Cate et al., 2015).  
69 Completing an EPA, students receive feedback from the supervisor on their performance,  
70 which provides the basis for future entrustment decisions. This linkage of activity and  
71 supervision level creates a performance-based training, so-called competency-based  
72 medical education. The overall aim is to gradually reduce supervision and increase students'  
73 responsibilities based on individual progress (Peters et al., 2017). The five grades described  
74 by Chen (2015) are "allowed to observe" (grade 1), "direct supervision" (grade 2), "indirect  
75 supervision" (grade 3), "acting unsupervised" (grade 4), "guiding others" (Grade 5) (see  
76 Table 1).

77 Starting in Canada, this concept of competency-based medical education has already been  
78 implemented in several countries as a didactic approach for the graduate level. In Germany,  
79 EPAs have just started to become part of medical undergraduate and graduate education.  
80 Academic teachers of the Charité Berlin University defined twelve core EPAs, grouped into  
81 5 EPA domains, to measure preparedness for entry into residency: 1. along the clinical  
82 encounter, 2. general medical procedures, 3. communicating with patients, 4.  
83 communicating and collaborating with colleagues, 5. patient care in special situations  
84 (Holzhausen et al., 2019). A pilot study described the implementation of EPAs with 62 final  
85 year students in four German universities concluding that more work is needed to integrate  
86 EPAs in medical curricula (Schick et al., 2019).

87

88 Our TFM is an approach to implement EPAs in general practice rotations of undergraduate  
89 students. Students and supervisors will be surveyed directly after the rotation. Students'  
90 overall satisfaction with their learning progress is the primary outcome of this controlled trial.

91

## 92 **Objectives {7}**

93 This study evaluates the effectiveness of the teaching concept TFM on students' overall  
94 satisfaction with their learning progress after the rotation. The evaluation will compare  
95 students from practices with TFM use (intervention) and without (control). We hypothesize  
96 that the TFM will improve learning satisfaction compared to traditional training.

97

## 98 **Trial design {8}**

99 This teaching quality improvement project will be performed as an intervention trial.  
100 Teaching practices and students will be allocated in a groupwise manner. The first 47

101 students will serve as the control group. The next 47 students will serve as the intervention  
102 group using the toolbox.

103 This approach is needed to avoid contamination on the student or practice level, i.e. a  
104 practice will not educate control group students after participating in the toolbox teaching.  
105 All control practices will receive the toolbox education and materials after the study's  
106 completion (waiting list control approach).

107  
108  
109 **Methods: Participants, interventions and outcomes**

#### 110 **Study setting {9}**

111 The study will be conducted in family practices accredited by the Institute of General Practice  
112 and Family Medicine, University of Bonn. They are located in the greater Bonn area. As part  
113 of the undergraduate curriculum, medical students have a two-week practice rotation in  
114 family medicine, which takes place in their last clinical semester prior to the final year. All  
115 practices and students of the next two terms will be included in the quality improvement  
116 project.

#### 118 **Eligibility criteria {10}**

119 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for practices: Family practices are eligible if they are  
120 accredited teaching practices of the Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine,  
121 University of Bonn.

122 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for students: Participating students must be enrolled at the  
123 University of Bonn and scheduled for the family practice rotation. Students will be excluded  
124 when changing the practice during their rotation.

125

126 **Who will take informed consent? {26a}**

127 The Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn has agreed to the  
128 teaching quality improvement project and deemed it exempt from review on August 26,  
129 2021. Teaching practices and students participate on a voluntary basis.

130

131 **Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and**  
132 **biological specimens {26b}**

133 Not applicable, because no biological specimen will be obtained.

134

135 **Interventions**

136 **Explanation for the choice of comparators {6b}**

137 Students of the control group will complete the usual general practice rotation in practices  
138 without TFM intervention.

139

140 **Intervention description {11a}**

141 The intervention ‘Toolbox Family Medicine’ comprises (1) a TFM training for teaching  
142 physicians focused on didactics, (2) the Toolbox Family Medicine with the EPAs and (3) an  
143 EPA-compendium, recording the performed EPAs with the respective supervision level (see  
144 Table 1).

145 The TFM intervention will be applied in a two-week rotation in intervention practices.

146

147 Elements of the ‘Toolbox Family Medicine’ (TFM):

148 1. TFM training for teaching physicians:

149 a) Invitation email with a brief explanation of the new concept.

150 b) Practice visits to hand over and introduce the TFM card box.

151 c) One-hour online workshops for supervising physicians: Groups of six to ten  
152 teaching physicians will be educated on the concept and use of the toolbox focusing  
153 on didactics (e.g. feedback and teachable moments).

154 2. Toolbox with EPAs (index card box):

155 a) Index cards with information on EPAs, feedback rules, application of the toolbox.

156 b) Index cards with short and more complex tasks supplemented by the

157 recommended supervision levels, more in-depth information and questions.

158 Following the supervision levels for medical education (see Table 1) (Chen et al., 2015), we  
159 defined limits for the performance of the various medical activities for undergraduate medical  
160 education (see Table 2). During their two-week rotation, students may perform EPAs up to  
161 a level of 3a.

162

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| Level 1 | Not allowed to practice EPA<br>a) Inadequate knowledge/ skill; not allowed to observe<br>-----<br>b) Adequate knowledge/ some skill, allowed to observe  |
| Level 2 | May act under proactive, ongoing, full supervision (direct)<br>a) As coactivity with supervisor<br>-----<br>b) With supervisor in room, ready to step in as needed   |
| Level 3 | May act under reactive supervision (indirect)<br>a) With supervisor immediately available, all findings double-checked<br>-----<br>b) With supervisor immediately available, key findings double-checked<br>-----<br>c) With supervisor distantly available, findings reviewed |
| Level 4 | May act unsupervised   |
| Level 5 | Allowed to supervise others in the practice of EPA   |

163 **Table 1:** EPA supervision levels (Chen et al. 2015)



164 An expert panel of five experienced supervising physicians and three GPs in training defined  
165 a total of 72 EPAs in five fields: medical history (1), physical examination (2), skills (3),  
166 communication (4), chief complaints (5). For details see Table 2.  
167 For the two-week, full-day rotation in family practices, 21 EPAs were selected as core EPAs  
168 obligatory for all students. The teaching physician may select additional EPAs. After  
169 performing an EPA, the teaching physician will provide feedback to the student on the  
170 entrusted level. Additional information and questions on the index cards provide an  
171 orientation for the teaching physician for more in-depth teaching related to the EPA.  
172 Students should reach an entrustment level of 2b or 3a on all core EPAs, as defined in Table  
173 2. Hence, respective EPAs may be performed and supervised several times until the student  
174 reaches the required entrustment level (Peters et al., 2017).

| #                             | EPAs                             | Supervision level for two-week rotation |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>1 Medical history</b>      |                                  |   |
| 1.1                           | Past medical history             | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.2                           | Medication                       | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.3                           | Risk factors                     | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.4                           | Review of systems                | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.5                           | Mental and psychological history | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.6                           | Social history                   | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.7                           | Family history                   | 1b-3a                                   |
| 1.8                           | Occupational history             | 1b-3a                                   |
| <b>2 Physical examination</b> |                                  |   |
| 2.1                           | Head (incl. cranial nerves)      | 1b-3a                                   |
| 2.2                           | Neck                             | 1b-3a                                   |
| 2.3                           | Chest                            | 1b-3a                                   |
| 2.4                           | Abdomen                          | 1b-3a                                   |
| 2.5                           | Skin                             | 1b-3a                                   |
| 2.6                           | Musculoskeletal system           | 1b-3a                                   |

|                           |  |       |
|---------------------------|--|-------|
| 2.7                       | Mental status and nervous system                         | 1b-3a |
| 2.8                       | Vascular status  | 1b-3a |
| <b>3 Skills</b>           |  |       |
| 3.1                       | Blood pressure measurement                               | 1b-3a |
| 3.2                       | Urine test (dip stick)                                   | 1b-3a |
| 3.3                       | Venous blood draw  | 1b-3a |
| 3.4                       | Electrocardiogram  | 1b-3a |
| 3.5                       | Measurement of blood glucose (finger stick)              | 1b-3a |
| 3.6                       | Ankle-Brachial-Index                                     | 1b-3a |
| 3.7                       | Geriatric assessment                                     | 1b-3a |
| 3.8                       | Subcutaneous/ intramuscular injection (e.g. vaccination) | 1b-2b |
| 3.9                       | Spirometry   | 1b-3a |
| 3.10                      | Otoscopy   | 1b-3a |
| 3.11                      | Wound care   | 1b-2b |
| 3.12                      | Abdominal ultrasound                                     | 1b-2b |
| 3.13                      | Thyroid ultrasound                                       | 1b-2b |
| 3.14                      | Exercise ECG   | 1b-2b |
| 3.15                      | Interpretation of laboratory findings                    | 1b-3a |
| 3.16                      | Medication adjustment for renal dysfunction              | 1b-3a |
| 3.17                      | Medication adjustment in geriatric patient               | 1b-3a |
| <b>4 Communication</b>    |  |       |
| 4.1                       | Advice on weight reduction                               | 1b-3a |
| 4.2                       | Importance of long-term blood pressure therapy           | 1b-3a |
| 4.3                       | Alcohol cessation  | 1b-2b |
| 4.4                       | Smoking cessation  | 1b-2b |
| 4.5                       | Illness theory and therapy adherence                     | 1b-3a |
| 4.6                       | Consultation on need and conduct of vaccinations         | 1b-2b |
| 4.7                       | Intercultural aspects of medical care                    | 1b-3a |
| 4.8                       | Living will/ health care proxy                           | 1b-3a |
| 4.9                       | Osteoporosis   | 1b-3a |
| <b>5 Chief complaints</b> |  |       |
| 5.1                       | General check-up, 20-30 year-old patient                 | 1b-3a |

|      |  |       |
|------|--|-------|
| 5.2  | General check-up, 50-60 year-old patient   | 1b-3a |
| 5.3  | General check-up, > 75 year-old patient  | 1b-3a |
| 5.4  | Home visit   | 1b-2b |
| 5.5  | Nursing home visit   | 1b-2b |
| 5.6  | Dysuria  | 1b-3a |
| 5.7  | Headache   | 1b-3a |
| 5.8  | Chest pain   | 1b-3a |
| 5.9  | Low back pain  | 1b-3a |
| 5.10 | Hip pain   | 1b-3a |
| 5.11 | Knee pain  | 1b-3a |
| 5.12 | Shoulder pain  | 1b-3a |
| 5.13 | Neck pain  | 1b-3a |
| 5.14 | Upper abdominal pain   | 1b-3a |
| 5.15 | Lower abdominal pain   | 1b-3a |
| 5.16 | Diarrhea   | 1b-3a |
| 5.17 | Sleep disorders  | 1b-3a |
| 5.18 | Dizziness  | 1b-3a |
| 5.19 | Acute psycho-social stress   | 1b-2b |
| 5.20 | Vaccination advice (incl. Vaccination)   | 1b-2b |
| 5.21 | Disease management program (DMP) type 2 diabetes                                 | 1b-3a |
| 5.22 | DMP asthma   | 1b-3a |
| 5.23 | DMP coronary heart disease   | 1b-3a |
| 5.24 | DMP heart failure  | 1b-3a |
| 5.25 | Cough  | 1b-3a |
| 5.26 | Joint pain   | 1b-3a |
| 5.27 | Sore throat and ear ache   | 1b-3a |
| 5.28 | Preoperative assessment  | 1b-2b |
| 5.29 | Post-discharge visit   | 1b-2b |
| 5.30 | Emergency situation management (focus on handover to emergency medical services) | 1b-2b |

175  
176  
177

**Table 2:** List of 72 EPAs and targeted supervision level for rotations in family practices; Core-EPAs are marked with a grey background.

178 **Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions {11b}**

179 Teaching physicians who are invited to the intervention but unable to attend the scheduled  
180 TFM training are assigned to the control group. The statistical analyses will account for  
181 this.

182

183 **Strategies to improve adherence to interventions {11c}**

184 Practices and students are routinely provided with the contact information of the teaching  
185 secretary (phone number, email) to report any problem prior or during the rotation.

186

187 **Relevant concomitant care permitted or prohibited during the trial {11d}**

188 Not applicable as the study is a teaching intervention.

189 **Provisions for post-trial care {30}**

190 Not applicable as the study is a teaching intervention.

191

192 **Outcomes {12}**

193 **Primary outcome:**

194 The primary outcome is the students' overall satisfaction with their learning progress using  
195 a five-point Likert scale.

196

197 **Secondary outcomes:**

198 The student rotation in family practices has been routinely evaluated for years. This  
199 evaluation will continue with additional questions regarding satisfaction with their practice  
200 placement using the Placement Evaluation Tool (PET), which was initially created for  
201 nursing placements in Australia (Cooper et al., 2020) and translated to German (Schroeder  
202 et al., 2021). Students of the control and intervention groups will receive the same survey.

203 Teaching physicians of both groups will receive questions on the execution of the two-week  
 204 rotation and questions on students' performance, the latter of which are matched to the PET  
 205 questionnaire. In intervention practices only, the following data will be obtained: satisfaction  
 206 with the toolbox content, practicality of the index card box approach, feasibility of  
 207 implementing the concept in everyday practice flow; students' record of the performed EPAs  
 208 and the supervision levels entrusted by the teaching physician.

209

210 **Participant timeline {13}**

211 The timeline for teaching physicians and students is outlined in Figure 1.

212

| TIMEPOINT   | STUDY PERIOD                            |                       |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
|   | Enrollment                              | Allocation            | Post-allocation                                      |   |                                     |                                   | Close-out  |
|   | -t <sub>1</sub><br>Before start of term | 0<br>At start of term | t <sub>1</sub><br>Two weeks before start of rotation | t <sub>2</sub><br>One Week before start of rotation | t <sub>3</sub><br>Start of rotation | t <sub>4</sub><br>End of rotation | t <sub>x</sub><br>Achieving required student numbers |
| <b>ENROLLMENT:</b>  | X                                       |                       |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| Allocation  |   | X                     |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| <b>INTERVENTIONS:</b>   |   |                       |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| Practice visit with handover of toolbox   |   |                       | X  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| Education of teaching physicians (Online Workshop)                              |   |                       |  | X   |                                     |                                   |  |
| Using the TFM in practice rotations and recording performance in EPA compendium |   |                       |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| <b>ASSESSMENTS:</b>   |   |                       |  |   |                                     |                                   |  |
| Student: demographics   |   |                       |  |   |                                     | X                                 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Students: interest in family medicine  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Students: routine evaluation focused on execution of common tasks                              |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Students: practice placement evaluation (PET)  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| GP: demographics and teacher role  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| GP: rating students' performance (PET matching)  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| GP: Toolbox evaluation focused on feasibility, structure, effect on perceived teaching success |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| GP: evaluation of individual core EPAs   |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |

213

214 **Figure 1:** Schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments.

215

### 216 **Sample size {14}**

217 The sample size was calculated based on the primary outcome (students' overall learning  
 218 satisfaction). The primary outcome will be measured according to German university  
 219 grades ranging from 1 (best) to 5 (worst). The null hypothesis is that the median category  
 220 of the primary outcome is equal between control and intervention groups. The Wilcoxon-  
 221 Mann-Whitney-Test was used to determine the sample size based on the approach of  
 222 Happ (2019). This method requires prior information about the control and intervention  
 223 groups, which was retrieved from the study of Herwig et. al. (2017). For the control group,  
 224 we assumed the absolute frequencies of the group "interest in primary care decreased" for  
 225 the overall rating of the clerkship as prior information. The term "prior difference" is defined  
 226 as difference between absolute frequencies of the primary outcome in the "increased" and

227 "decreased" groups in overall rating of clerkship. We assumed half of the prior difference  
228 as a minimally relevant educational effect that we are interested in detecting. Based on  
229 this assumption, the prior sample of the intervention group was created by adding half of  
230 the prior difference to the prior sample of the control group. Furthermore, a significance  
231 threshold alpha of 5 %, power level of 80 %, and a student dropout of 5 % is applied to  
232 determine the sample size. As a result, this study aims for a controlled trial with at least 94  
233 medical students (47 intervention, 47 control).

234

### 235 **Recruitment {15}**

236 Scheduling for rotations will take place as usual. Practice rotations are part of the  
237 compulsory medical school curriculum. Family practices are invited by email and by  
238 phone. A complete timeline is presented in Figure 1.

239

### 240 **Assignment of interventions: allocation**

#### 241 **Sequence generation {16a}**

242 Using the routine academic schedule for upcoming rotations in family practices, half of the  
243 students and respective practices will serve as the control group. The second half of the  
244 students and respective practices will serve as the intervention group. Teaching physicians  
245 of the intervention group will be trained successively in small groups before new students  
246 are assigned to their practices. Practices participate based on availability.

#### 247 **{16b}**

248 The allocation sequence is based on the academic year schedule for practices and  
249 students. No additional allocation mechanisms are needed.

250

251 **Implementation {16c}**

252 Enrollment and assignment of students to practices will be performed by the teaching  
253 office as usual. After reaching the planned number of control practices, the subsequent  
254 practices will serve as intervention practices.

255

256 **Assignment of interventions: Blinding**

257 **Who will be blinded {17a}**

258 No blinding. Students and physicians of the intervention group are aware of the toolbox  
259 usage.

260 **Procedure for unblinding if needed {17b}**

261 Not applicable.

262 **Data collection and management**

263 **Plans for assessment and collection of outcomes {18a}**

264 Finishing their two-week rotation students will be invited to complete a survey on  
265 eCampus, the teaching platform of the University of Bonn. Teaching physicians will be  
266 invited to evaluate each rotation using a professional survey platform following data  
267 protection laws.

268 **Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up {18b}**

269 Physicians and students will receive up to two reminders to promote follow-up.

270 **Data management {19}**

271 **Confidentiality {27}**

272 All data will be stored following standards for data protection and data security at the  
273 Institute for General Practice and Family Medicine



274 University of Bonn, University Hospital Bonn

275 Venusberg-Campus 1

276 53127 Bonn, Germany.

277 All person-level data will be stored in an access-restricted master file. Data analyses will be  
278 performed with pseudonymized data only.

279

280 **Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation and storage of biological specimens for**  
281 **genetic or molecular analysis in this trial/future use {33}**

282 Not applicable. No samples collected.

283

## 284 **Statistical methods**

### 285 **Statistical methods for primary and secondary outcomes {20a}**

286 This protocol contains the entire statistical plan. Data management will follow standardized  
287 procedures (SOPs, Standard Operating Procedures). Primary and secondary outcomes will  
288 be analyzed using descriptive statistics. Inferential statistics will be performed for the primary  
289 outcome and selected secondary outcomes to analyze for predictors of learning satisfaction.

### 290 **Interim analyses {21b}**

291 No interim analysis is planned.

292

### 293 **Methods for additional analyses (e.g. subgroup analyses) {20b}**

294 Subgroup analysis will be performed by practice clusters.

295

296

297 **Methods in analysis to handle protocol non-adherence and any statistical methods**  
298 **to handle missing data {20c}**

299 Data imputation with standard procedures will be performed if needed to handle missing  
300 data (Van Buuren S, 2018).

301

302 **Plans to give access to the full protocol, participant level-data and statistical code**  
303 **{31c}**

304 The datasets generated and analysed during the study will not publicly available due to  
305 confidentiality issues for participating students and teaching physicians but are available  
306 from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

307

308 **Oversight and monitoring**

309 **Composition of the coordinating centre and trial steering committee {5d}**

310 Not applicable, as this is a teaching quality improvement project.

311

312 **Composition of the data monitoring committee, its role and reporting structure {21a}**

313 Not applicable, as this is a teaching quality improvement project.

314

315 **Adverse event reporting and harms {22}**

316 Not applicable, as this is a teaching quality improvement project.

317

318 **Frequency and plans for auditing trial conduct {23}**

319 Not applicable, as this is a teaching quality improvement project.

320 **Plans for communicating important protocol amendments to relevant parties (e.g.**  
321 **trial participants, ethical committees) {25}**

322 In case of modifications of the protocol, the above-mentioned ethics committee will be  
323 informed.

324

325 **Dissemination plans {31a}**

326 The study findings will be disseminated by journal publications and congress  
327 presentations.

328

329 **Discussion**

330 To our knowledge, this is the first controlled trial that studies the effectiveness of a toolbox  
331 concept with EPAs for undergraduate training in family practices. We expect a significant  
332 improvement in students' overall satisfaction with their learning progress by the intervention.

333

334 **Trial status**

335 The intervention will start with the first education of teaching physicians.

336

337 **Abbreviations**

338 EPA: Entrustable Professional Activity

339 TFM: Toolbox Family Medicine

340

341 **Declarations**

342 **Acknowledgements**

343 We owe thanks to the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn for providing financial  
344 support for a student research assistant within the Program for Teaching Quality. In  
345 addition, we thank the team of teaching physicians for their support in developing and  
346 reviewing the EPAs.

347

348 **Authors’ contributions {31b}**

349 BW conceived the study. NA drafted the first version of the manuscript together with BW  
350 and DW. NA, JS and MW developed the content of the toolbox index cards and their design.  
351 TW performed the sample size calculation and advised on the statistical approach. All  
352 authors contributed to the study protocol and the development of the intervention. All authors  
353 provided feedback on the manuscript and approved the final version.

354

355 **Funding {4}**

356 The study conduct is supported by a restricted grant for a student research assistant by  
357 the Program for Teaching Quality of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn which  
358 has no influence on any part of the study.

359

360 **Availability of data and materials {29}**

361 Only scientists of the Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine, University of  
362 Bonn, will have access to the final pseudonymized dataset. A master file with names of the  
363 participating teaching physicians will be stored in the access-restricted teaching databank  
364 of the institute.

365 **Ethics approval and consent to participate {24}**

366 This study complies with the ethical principles of the World Medical Association Declaration  
367 of Helsinki. As the study constitutes a teaching quality improvement project without risks to  
368 the participants, the Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn  
369 deemed it exempt from review on August 26, 2021. Participants are informed on the purpose  
370 and the voluntary nature of the evaluation. Participation in the online-evaluation is  
371 considered informed consent.

372

### 373 **Consent for publication {32}**

374 Not applicable. No data relating to an individual person will be published.

375

### 376 **Competing interests {28}**

377 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

378

### 379 **Authors’ information (optional)**

380 Not applicable.

381

## 382 **References**

383 Chen HC, van den Broek WES, Ten Cate O. The case for use of entrustable professional  
384 activities in undergraduate medical education. *Academic medicine*. 2015; doi:  
385 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000586

386 Cooper S, Cant R, Waters D, et al. Measuring the quality of nursing clinical placements  
387 and the development of the Placement Evaluation Tool (PET) in a mixed methods co-  
388 design project. *BMC nursing*. 2020; doi: 10.1186/s12912-020-00491-1.

389 Happ M, Bathke AC, Brunner E. Optimal sample size planning for the Wilcoxon-Mann-  
390 Whitney test. *Statistics in medicine*. 2019; doi: 10.1002/sim.7983.

- 391 Herwig A, Viehmann A, Thielmann A, et al. Relevance of clerkship characteristics in  
392 changing students' interest in family medicine: a questionnaire survey. *BMJ open*. 2017;  
393 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012794.
- 394 Holzhausen Y, Maaz A, Renz A, et al. Development of Entrustable Professional Activities  
395 for entry into residency at the Charité Berlin. *GMS journal for medical education*. 2019; doi:  
396 10.3205/zma001213.
- 397 Pershing S, Fuchs VR. Restructuring medical education to meet current and future health  
398 care needs. *Academic Medicine*. 2013; doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000020.
- 399 Peters H, Holzhausen Y, Boscardin C, et al. Twelve tips for the implementation of EPAs  
400 for assessment and entrustment decisions. *Medical teacher*. 2017; doi:  
401 10.1080/0142159X.2017.1331031.
- 402 Schick K, Eissner A, Wijnen-Meijer M, et al. Implementing a logbook on entrustable  
403 professional activities in the final year of undergraduate medical education in Germany - a  
404 multicentric pilot study. *GMS journal for medical education*. 2019; doi:  
405 10.3205/zma001277.
- 406 Schroeder J, Wehner M, Amarell N, et al. Evaluation of practice rotations using the  
407 Placement Evaluation Tool (PET): A standardized translation involving medical students  
408 and teaching physicians. Poster presented at: 93rd EGPRN Meeting, October 16, 2021;  
409 Halle (Saale) Germany.
- 410 Ten Cate O, Chen HC, Hoff RG, et al. Curriculum development for the workplace using  
411 Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs). *Medical Teacher*. 2015; doi:  
412 10.3109/0142159X.2015.1060308.
- 413 Van Buuren S. *Flexible Imputation of Missing Data*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chapman & Hall/CRC  
414 *Interdisciplinary Statistics Series*; 2018.
- 415