






# 1                   Telehealth Equity and Access

## 2                   Communication Skills Pilot Simulation for

### 3                   Practicing Clinicians

4

5 Christopher J. Nash <sup>1\*</sup> , Susan E. Farrell <sup>2</sup> , Jossie A. Carreras Tartak <sup>3</sup> , Alexei Wagner <sup>4</sup>,

6 Lea C. Brandt <sup>5</sup> , Emily M. Hayden <sup>6</sup> 

7

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, Duke University Hospital, Durham, North Carolina, USA

9 <sup>2</sup> Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

10 <sup>3</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts,

11 USA

12 <sup>4</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

13 <sup>5</sup> Center for Health Ethics, University of Missouri School of Medicine, Columbia, Missouri, USA

14 <sup>6</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

15 \* Corresponding Author

16 Email: [chris.nash@duke.edu](mailto:chris.nash@duke.edu)

## 17 **Abstract**

18 Objectives: This pilot study evaluated a telehealth training simulation program for practicing  
19 clinicians, specifically focused on addressing patient issues of equity and access to healthcare  
20 via improving telehealth communication.

21 Methods: Participants participated in a one-hour simulation experience with two cases.

22 Performance was assessed pre- and post-intervention using a checklist measuring  
23 communication domains related to equity and access in telehealth. Participant satisfaction was  
24 secondarily measured via survey.

25 Results: Results showed measurable gains in clinicians' abilities to effectively incorporate equity  
26 and access communication skills. Participants found the session useful and recommended the  
27 training experience.

28 Conclusions: The findings of this pilot study highlight the potential of simulation-based  
29 telehealth training for practicing clinicians, emphasizing clinicians' attention to patients'  
30 equitable access to healthcare. Future studies should aim to explore the durability of learning  
31 and investigate the generalizability of this training approach to other telehealth competencies  
32 and settings.

## 33 Introduction

34 As telehealth becomes more integrated into healthcare delivery [1–4], it is increasingly  
35 important that healthcare professionals learn the necessary skills to effectively care for patients  
36 in the virtual environment. Healthcare delivery via telehealth presents distinct challenges from  
37 the traditional care environment [5]. The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC)  
38 created core competencies defining specific skills including conducting a virtual physical  
39 examination, troubleshooting technological failures, and communicating through a virtual  
40 connection [6–8]. The AAMC telehealth competencies serve as the best guide to-date for  
41 designing and implementing curricula for telehealth training and competency evaluation for  
42 medical providers.

43  
44 Despite the growing need to train medical professionals in virtual care, as of 2021-22, less than  
45 sixty percent of medical schools and nursing schools included any formal training in virtual  
46 healthcare delivery [9,10], and even fewer physician assistant (PA) programs incorporated  
47 formal telehealth curricula [11]. Unfortunately, those programs that include telehealth training  
48 implement their courses as electives and without robust evaluation of educational outcomes  
49 [12]. This lack of undergraduate preparation for telehealth care means that most telehealth  
50 practitioners have never been formally taught how to best care for their patients remotely  
51 [13,14], creating a training gap that should be addressed urgently.

52  
53 Simulation-based training has proven to be an effective educational method in healthcare, as  
54 clinicians can practice and refine their communication skills in a risk-free environment, and

55 standardized patient (SP) actors have been increasingly utilized to conduct realistic simulated  
56 telehealth encounters for training and assessment [15–21]. The use of standardized patients to  
57 deliver feedback as a primary component of education has been extensively studied and is  
58 known to be an effective technique for adult learning in simulated environments, including in  
59 telehealth simulation [22–25]. However, most descriptions of telehealth training in the  
60 literature that utilize SP actors involve undergraduate trainees—depictions of SP-based training  
61 for the practicing clinician are growing but are currently scant [22,26–28], and there is a lack of  
62 specific, evidence-based information in the literature about communication in telehealth care  
63 for practicing clinicians [29]. Our team’s previous experience with video-based simulated  
64 telehealth encounters demonstrated that practicing clinicians believe that this type of program  
65 builds confidence and skills in the use of the telehealth modality [22]. We focused on  
66 communication skills for this study because we recognized that there is significant risk of  
67 perpetuating inequity in healthcare, and telehealth may add an additional layer of complexity  
68 for these interactions that prior formal communications training may not have adequately  
69 addressed [30–34]. Furthermore, to date no studies have focused on training programs  
70 specifically oriented to incorporate issues of equity and access in the telehealth—a key domain  
71 within the AAMC telehealth competencies that is important yet currently underexplored [6].  
72 The incorporation of telehealth in clinical practice has the potential to exacerbate inequity; our  
73 team believes that formal, intentional educational efforts to combat this are needed [30,32].  
74  
75 This pilot study sought to address the telehealth communications training gap by creating a  
76 simulation experience for practicing clinicians, suitable for both physicians and advanced

77 practice practitioners (APPs). We aimed to assess the efficacy of an SP-delivered educational  
78 experience in which the SP provided both the portrayal of the patient and the generation and  
79 delivery of feedback to the practicing clinicians as an educational intervention. Our primary  
80 outcome was the practicing clinicians' checklist-based performance on AAMC-aligned  
81 telehealth competencies, specifically centered on Domains II and III (equity, access, and  
82 communication) [8]. Secondly, we captured the participants' perceptions of knowledge  
83 acquisition via pre- and post-session survey.

84

## 85 **Methods**

### 86 **Study Design**

87 This study was a prospective interventional study that received pilot funding from the AAMC  
88 Telehealth Equity Catalyst (TEC) grant. Utilizing Kolb's Experiential Learning conceptual  
89 framework [35–37], an SP-led one-hour simulation-based learning experience was designed  
90 consisting of two cases. Learning objectives (S1 Appendix) for the sessions were designed to  
91 map to the AAMC telehealth competencies [8]. Each participant completed both cases (A and  
92 B), in a cross-over design with half doing Case A first and half doing Case B first. Standardized  
93 patient feedback was given to participants after each case by the SP. Participants were  
94 surveyed before and after the experience, and their performance was recorded in performance  
95 checklists.

96

### 97 **Setting and Participants**

98 Eligible participants were physicians or APPs within a fourteen-hospital medical system serving  
99 a large urban area in the Northeastern United States practicing in generalist specialties,  
100 including emergency medicine, virtual urgent care, internal medicine, and primary care. We did  
101 not include pediatrics in this study for consistency of the simulated telehealth patient  
102 encounters. Subjects participated on a voluntary basis and were scheduled at times convenient  
103 to their schedules. There were no exclusion criteria. Study participants were recruited via email  
104 between January and April 2023. The recruitment email outlined the study, encompassing both  
105 the potential risks and benefits. Additionally, it reminded participants of their right to withdraw  
106 from the study at any point. Data was collected contemporaneously. We aimed for the  
107 recruitment of 30 individuals for participation to comply with budgetary limitations in this  
108 study. Participants' consent was implied by participation in the study, and the requirement for  
109 formal written documentation of consent was waived by the institutional review board (IRB).  
110 This study was approved by the IRB at Massachusetts General Hospital (Agreement number  
111 2022A006072).

112

## 113 **Case Design**

114 We designed two cases (S2 Appendix and S3 Appendix) suitable to a generalist / urgent care  
115 environment, intentionally crafted by our study team to surface issues of communication and  
116 equity in healthcare access. Case A was a case of a 56-year-old person with hypertension  
117 seeking care for headaches, but with additional life stressors including juggling the potential  
118 loss of a job, caring for her grandchildren, and participating in online school. Case B was a 56-  
119 year-old person with a history of asthma who had been missing work due to frequent

120 exacerbations, but with difficulty affording medication refills. The cases were written and  
121 iterated by experts in telehealth, standardized patient case design, ethics, and diversity, equity,  
122 and inclusion.

123  
124 Prior to the first live session with participants, we held a training session with the SP actors to  
125 ensure consistency in the actor portrayal. Additionally, as the SPs were expected to complete  
126 checklists and provide feedback after each simulated encounter, this activity was modeled and  
127 practiced by the SPs. We reviewed the cases with the SPs for clarity and adjusted their timing to  
128 fit in the ten minutes allotted for each simulation.

129

## 130 **Data Sources and Instrument Design**

131 Prior to the simulation sessions, participants received learning objectives and a pre-session  
132 survey (S4 Appendix). Surveys were administered using REDCap (Vanderbilt University,  
133 Nashville, TN). There were no other pre-session requirements for the session, including no pre-  
134 session didactics, minimizing the time requirements for the clinicians who volunteered to  
135 participate in this study outside of regular work hours. Sessions took place via Microsoft Teams  
136 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA).

137

138 Each session included two participants and two trained SPs. Each encounter lasted  
139 approximately 10 minutes, immediately followed by 7 minutes during which the SP delivered  
140 immediate feedback to the participant. We created a learning objective-aligned checklist to  
141 assess performance and communication skills of the participants that was modified from the

142 Kalamazoo Essential Elements Communications Checklists [38,39]. This checklist was chosen as  
143 a template for our project because it has previously been validated, including in modified forms  
144 [40–42]. The checklist contained a total of 22 assessment items (S5 Appendix). Participants’  
145 performance was assessed in each of their two cases.

146  
147 The SP completed the checklist in REDCap (Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN) simultaneous to  
148 or immediately after providing feedback at the end of each case. This allowed feedback to be  
149 aligned with learning objectives and, therefore, the AAMC competencies [8]. Participants then  
150 performed their second 10-minute case, followed again by feedback. After the session,  
151 participants completed a post-session survey (S6 Appendix). The surveys were designed to  
152 gauge participants’ self-perception of learning objective-aligned skills as a measure of growth,  
153 as well as demographic data. A crossover design was utilized to reduce the risk that measured  
154 improvement could be due to unmeasured differences in difficulty between the two cases.

155

## 156 **Data Analysis**

157 Data was analyzed using Stata (StataCorp, College Station, Texas, version 17) and Microsoft  
158 Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA). Descriptive statistics were generated to  
159 understand the demographics of the study participants. Paired T-tests were used to test for  
160 differences in pre- and post-session survey responses and to evaluate differences in  
161 participants’ checklist performance between cases one and two.

162

## 163 **Results**



164 A total of 30 clinicians participated in the study (Table 1). Participants included six physicians  
 165 (20%) and 24 advanced practice providers (NPs or PAs). Participants ranged in experience (0-  
 166 20+ years out of training), and approximately half had participated in telehealth in the past (15,  
 167 one missing response). All participants (100%) completed all pre and post surveys, and all  
 168 performance checklists (100%) were completed by the SPs.

169 **Table 1:** Participant Characteristics  
 170

<b>Gender (n = 30)</b>	
Male	9 (30%)
Female	21 (70%)
Non-Binary, Other	0 (0%)
<b>Physician or Advanced Practice Provider (n = 30)</b>	
Physician	6 (20%)
Advanced Practice Provider	24 (80%)
<b>Physicians: How many years have you been in practice since residency? (n = 6)</b>	
0-5 years	2 (33.3%)
5-10 years	1 (16.7%)
11-15 years	1 (16.7%)
16-20 years	0 (0%)
20+ years	2 (33.3%)
<b>Advanced Practice Providers: How many years have you been in practice? (n = 24)</b>	
0-5 years	11 (45.8%)
5-10 years	10 (41.7%)
11-15 years	2 (8.3%)
16-20 years	1 (4.2%)
20+ years	0 (0%)
<b>Have you provided patient care via video-based telehealth in the past? (n = 30)</b>	
Yes	15 (50.0%)
No	14 (46.7%)
(blank)	1 (3.3%)
<b>With which programs have you provided telehealth? (n = 30)</b>	
Partners Healthcare on Demand	4 (13.3%)
Virtual Observation Unit	1 (3.3%)
iPads in the ED during COVID	1 (3.3%)
Virtual Visits for Primary Care Patients	6 (20.0%)
MGB Virtual Urgent Care	9 (30.0%)
Hospital-at-Home	0 (0.0%)
AFC Urgent Care	1 (3.3%)

171

172

## 173 Primary Objectives

174 Our primary objective was performance changes between cases as measured by the checklist.  
 175 Overall, baseline performance for most checklist items for their first case was quite high, and in  
 176 many cases all 30 participants met the correctly performed checklist items in both of their cases  
 177 (Table 2). Some item ratings demonstrated statistically significant improvements after receiving  
 178 SP feedback on the first case. Specifically, improvement in performance was seen for “ensures  
 179 my privacy by making sure that my space is private for me” ( $p = 0.0226$ ), “ensures my privacy by  
 180 making sure and indicating they are in a private space for their conversation (e.g., nobody else  
 181 can hear our conversation on their end)” ( $p < 0.01$ ), and “ensures that I have access to  
 182 resources that will support my post-encounter care” ( $p = 0.0117$ ).

183 **Table 2:** Checklist Performance by Case  
 184

Question	Case 1: Percentage who performed (std. error)	Case 2: Percentage who performed (std. error)  Paired T-test p value ( <b>bold</b> = statistically significant)
1. Ensures my privacy by making sure that my space is private for me (n = 30)	26.7% (SE = 8.2%)	60.0% (SE = 9.1%)  <b>p = 0.0226</b>
2. Ensures my privacy by making sure and indicating they are in a private space for their conversation with me (e.g., nobody else can hear our conversation on their end) (n = 30)	23.3% (SE = 7.9%)	63.3% (SE = 8.9%)  <b>p = 0.0052</b>
3. Avoids background noise (n = 30)	100%	100%
4. Uses appropriate lighting so that I can see them (n = 30)	100%	100%

5. Turns off other applications (e.g., no other notification noises from emails or messages) (n = 28)	100%	100%
6. Adjusts camera to eye level so that I can see their face (n = 29)	100%	96.6% (SE = 3.4%) p = 0.3259
7. Dresses professionally (n = 29)	89.7% (SE = 5.8%)	96.6% (SE = 3.4%) p = 0.3259
8. Begins information exchange by creating relaxed, empathetic environment that promotes good exchange between myself (the patient) and clinician (n = 30)	93.3% (SE = 4.6%)	100% p = 0.1608
9. Uses non-judgmental statements when communicating with me (n = 30)	100%	100%
10. Narrates and explains their actions (e.g., if they need to look at another screen while on the visit) (n = 14)	100%	92.9% (SE = 7.1%) p = 0.3356
11. Speaks clearly and deliberately so that I can understand (n = 30)	100%	100%
12. Uses non-verbal language to show they are listening to me (n = 29)	100%	100%
13. Uses pauses to facilitate bilateral communication (listening to me, observing me), allowing patient to contribute to information exchange (n = 29)	100%	100%
14. Suggests escalation of care (e.g., go to the ED, visit in-person) if clinician believes I am unsafe (or I express that I feel unsafe) with distance	100%	100%

care plan or in my current environment (n = 6)		
15. Ensures that my care is concordant with my preferences and values (n = 30)	100%	100%
16. Explores whether I have social supports and incorporates them as able (if in line with my wishes) (n = 29)	48.3% (SE = 9.4%)	69.0% (SE = 8.7%) p = 0.1609
17. Thoroughly and accurately educates me about my illness, its management, and possible consequences with sensitivity to my concerns and preferences (n = 30)	96.7% (SE = 3.3%)	100% p = 0.3256
18. Verbalizes and clarifies post-encounter plans for my care (n = 30)	96.7% (SE = 3.3%)	100% p = 0.3256
19. Ensures that I have access to resources that will support my post-encounter care (n = 30)	80% (SE = 7.4%)	100% <b>p = 0.0117</b>
20. Adjusts physical examination to the virtual environment (n = 7)	85.7% (SE = 14.3%)	100% p = 0.3559
21. Guides the patient through physical exam maneuvers (n = 11)	72.7% (SE = 14.1%)	81.8% (SE = 12.2%) p = 0.5884
22. Collects/uses the data captured by the patient (e.g., vital signs such as heart rate or where the patient reports pain) (n = 21)	71.4% (SE = 8.8%)	81.0% (SE = 10.1%) p = 0.5402

185

## 186 Secondary Objectives

187 Overall, participants reported that they would recommend this training experience, with a

188 mean of 8.8 (SD 1.49) on a Likert scale from 0 (Not at all likely) to 10 (Extremely likely).

189 Participants' responses to every survey question demonstrated a statistically significant  
 190 improvement in self-perceived performance/skill level in all learning-objective aligned items  
 191 (Table 3).

192 **Table 3:** Participants' Self-Perceived Performance Pre- and Post-Session  
 193 Attitudes

Question	Pre: Mean (std. error) 95% CI	Post: Mean (std. error) 95% CI  Paired T-test p value ( <b>bold</b> = statistically significant)
I can describe at least two ways to adjust physical characteristics (physical space, camera, lighting, microphone) to ensure that the patient experiences a safe environment for a video-based telehealth encounter.	3.87 (SE = 0.19) [3.48, 4.26]	4.67 (SE = 0.15) [4.35, 4.98]  <b>p = 0.0021</b>
I can describe at least two ways that I can use words/language/dialogue to ensure that the patient experiences a safe environment for a video-based telehealth encounter.	3.97 (SE = 0.11) [3.74, 4.20]	4.53 (SE = 0.17) [4.17, 4.90]  <b>p = 0.0088</b>
I can give two examples of techniques to create a therapeutic rapport via telehealth by using verbal communication techniques and nonverbal behaviors.	3.93 (SE = 0.13) [3.68, 4.19]	4.63 (SE = 0.15) [4.33, 4.94]  <b>p = 0.0018</b>
I feel confident applying language that partners with the patient to ascertain and mitigate any risks or unsafe conditions related to the patient's care.	3.83 (SE = 0.17) [3.49, 4.17]	4.50 (SE = 0.18) [4.14, 4.86]  <b>p = 0.0126</b>
I can describe at least two ways to inquire about and include a patient's	3.87 (SE = 0.16) [3.55, 4.19]	4.43 (SE = 0.17) [4.08, 4.78]

family/social support to enhance care during and after a telehealth encounter.		<b>p = 0.0216</b>
I can describe language techniques to ensure mutually understood post-encounter care plans with my patient and the accessibility of care needs before concluding a telehealth encounter.	3.90 (SE = 0.18) [3.53, 4.27]	4.57 (SE = 0.18) [4.20, 4.93]  <b>p = 0.0086</b>
<b>How likely are you to recommend this Simulated Telehealth Experience to your colleagues?</b> (Scale of 1 to 10)		
Min 5 Max 10 Median 9 Mean 8.8 Std Dev 1.49		

194

## 195 Discussion

196 As telehealth education continues to assume a more central role in health professions  
 197 education, studies that demonstrate evidence for effective training are timely and needed. In  
 198 this pilot study, we conducted a training program for 30 practicing clinicians. We found that the  
 199 use of SP-generated feedback as a primary educational strategy resulted in improved  
 200 performance as measured on learning-objective aligned checklists, with improvement in  
 201 multiple domains related to equity and access in healthcare delivery reaching statistical  
 202 significance. The participants rated the learning experience highly and, when surveyed,  
 203 endorsed an improvement in confidence and skills for all measured learning objectives. We  
 204 believe this to be the first study to demonstrate improved telehealth communication  
 205 performance via telehealth simulated encounters for patient equity and access in healthcare  
 206 delivery. This is an important area for future research that should be replicated and expanded

207 upon to raise telehealth as a model for providing healthcare to patient populations who may  
208 otherwise have limited access. It is possible that this finding could be generalized from  
209 practicing clinicians to those in training.

210

211 One key aspect we sought to assess in our study was whether a simulation session without pre-  
212 session didactics could be effective. As a pilot, it was deemed beyond the scope of the study to  
213 develop a series of didactics, but it was also of interest to our team to assess if a shorter  
214 training approach could engender measurable learning and change for the learners.

215 Traditionally, pre-session didactics have been included as a part of a module or course [43–45];  
216 however, these studies typically are intended for medical trainees and not practicing clinicians  
217 [15,16,18,20,43–45]. Our study adds to the literature base for telehealth training for practicing  
218 clinicians. Typically courses with pre-session didactics require more time and may be less  
219 feasible for practicing clinicians who have limited training time. Our study suggests that, at least  
220 in some circumstances or for some competencies such as those focused on equity and access,  
221 simulation sessions that include focused SP feedback can stimulate behavior change with less  
222 time burden. Future research could continue to investigate short simulation sessions using a  
223 variety of case complexities as a mechanism of instruction for busy practicing clinicians.

224

225 This study demonstrates the feasibility of an actor-run session for telehealth communication  
226 training. Any software that allows for video calls, such as Microsoft Teams (Microsoft  
227 Corporation, Redmond, WA) or Zoom (Zoom Video Communications, San Jose, CA) could be  
228 utilized for sessions at low or no cost. The primary resource for carrying out this type of session



229 is the availability of funds to pay SPs, a cost that should be similar to other simulation sessions  
230 that utilize SP services. In our study, the trained SPs proved able to deliver feedback that  
231 improved performance on the participants' subsequent case. Thus, it is possible that trained  
232 SPs may be capable of teaching this skillset with reduced faculty or instructor involvement,  
233 enhancing the efficiency of resource use. The use of SP feedback as a modality for instruction  
234 has been well described in the literature [22,23,23–25,46], but this is the first study to our  
235 knowledge that demonstrates improved telehealth performance via this approach. In addition,  
236 it appears to be the first to focus on training in patient equity and access topics in telehealth.  
237 Future studies may further investigate or validate this finding, and to determine under which  
238 circumstances SPs alone may be able to teach telehealth communication skills.

239  
240 Given the scarcity of educational literature evaluating teaching methods for telehealth  
241 communication for practicing clinicians, innovative and evidence-based techniques are urgently  
242 necessary. Our study shows that communication skills for patient equity and access in  
243 healthcare can be taught efficiently to health professionals. This method of training may be  
244 generalizable to other telehealth competencies, such as technology failures or legal / ethical  
245 issues in telehealth, suggesting that future research should be directed to this aim.

246

## 247 **Limitations**

248 As a pilot study, the sample size was small and used no control group, limiting generalizability  
249 to other settings. Since participation in this study was voluntary, clinicians who were  
250 particularly interested or who felt particularly inexperienced in telehealth may have

251 volunteered, contributing to selection bias, which may have increased the measured effect size  
252 of the intervention. Although we sought representation from multiple generalist specialties,  
253 these results may not be generalizable to all specialties or non-academic urban medical centers.  
254 Limited resources prevented a measurement of the durability of learning, an area to direct  
255 future study. Additionally, the study did not include a formal needs assessment, which could  
256 have provided further insights into the specific educational needs of practicing clinicians in  
257 telehealth communication. Finally, although we feel that the use of a modified Kalamazoo  
258 Essential Elements Communications Checklists was logical and similar approaches have been  
259 taken in the past [18], any modification of an instrument threatens its validity.

260

## 261 **Conclusion**

262 This pilot study underscores the potential of simulation-based telehealth training for practicing  
263 clinicians. The findings suggest that such training can effectively enhance telehealth  
264 communication skills and address issues of equity and access in virtual healthcare delivery. The  
265 study also demonstrates participant satisfaction with actor-run sessions, which could be a cost-  
266 effective and time-efficient approach to telehealth training. However, the study's limitations,  
267 including its small sample size and lack of a control group, highlight the need for further  
268 research. Future studies should aim to validate these findings, explore the durability of learning,  
269 and investigate the generalizability of this training approach to other telehealth competencies  
270 and settings.

271

## 272 **Acknowledgements**

273 The authors thank the Association of American Medical Colleges for their help and guidance in  
274 conducting this research.

## References

- 275 1. Hollander JE, Carr BG. Virtually Perfect? Telemedicine for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*.  
276 2020;382: 1679–1681. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2003539
- 277 2. Bashshur RL, Howell JD, Krupinski EA, Harms KM, Bashshur N, Doarn CR. The Empirical  
278 Foundations of Telemedicine Interventions in Primary Care. *Telemed J E-Health Off J Am*  
279 *Telemed Assoc*. 2016;22: 342–375. doi:10.1089/tmj.2016.0045
- 280 3. Koonin LM, Hoots B, Tsang CA, Leroy Z, Farris K, Jolly T, et al. Trends in the Use of  
281 Telehealth During the Emergence of the COVID-19 Pandemic - United States, January-  
282 March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69: 1595–1599.  
283 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6943a3
- 284 4. Strazewski L. Telehealth’s post-pandemic future: Where do we go from here? In: American  
285 Medical Association [Internet]. 7 Sep 2020 [cited 21 Sep 2023]. Available:  
286 [https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/telehealth-s-post-pandemic-](https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/telehealth-s-post-pandemic-future-where-do-we-go-here)  
287 [future-where-do-we-go-here](https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/telehealth-s-post-pandemic-future-where-do-we-go-here)
- 288 5. van Galen LS, Wang CJ, Nanayakkara PWB, Paranjape K, Kramer MHH, Car J. Telehealth  
289 requires expansion of physicians’ communication competencies training. *Med Teach*.  
290 2019;41: 714–715. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2018.1481284
- 291 6. Galpin K, Sikka N, King SL, Horvath KA, Shipman SA, AAMC Telehealth Advisory Committee.  
292 Expert Consensus: Telehealth Skills for Health Care Professionals. *Telemed J E-Health Off J*  
293 *Am Telemed Assoc*. 2021;27: 820–824. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0420
- 294 7. Sharma R, Nachum S, Davidson KW, Nochomovitz M. It’s not just FaceTime: core  
295 competencies for the Medical Virtualist. *Int J Emerg Med*. 2019;12: 8. doi:10.1186/s12245-  
296 019-0226-y
- 297 8. AAMC. Telehealth competencies across the learning continuum. [cited 21 Sep 2023].  
298 Available: <https://collections.nlm.nih.gov/catalog/nlm:nlmuid-9918504887606676-pdf>
- 299 9. Khullar D, Mullangi S, Yu J, Weems K, Shipman SA, Caulfield M, et al. The state of  
300 telehealth education at U.S. medical schools. *Healthc Amst Neth*. 2021;9: 100522.  
301 doi:10.1016/j.hjdsi.2021.100522
- 302 10. Eckhoff DO, Guido-Sanz F, Anderson M. Telehealth across nursing education: Findings  
303 from a national study. *J Prof Nurs*. 2022;42: 308–314. doi:10.1016/j.profnurs.2022.07.013
- 304 11. Fleming S, Gordes KL, Cawley JF, Kulo V, Hagar E, Jun H-J, et al. Advancing Telehealth  
305 Competency in Physician Assistant Education: Stakeholder Perspectives and a Curricular  
306 Model for PA Programs. *J Physician Assist Educ*. 2022;33: 353.  
307 doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000461

- 308 12. Car LT, Kyaw BM, Panday RSN, Kleij R van der, Chavannes N, Majeed A, et al. Digital Health  
309 Training Programs for Medical Students: Scoping Review. *JMIR Med Educ.* 2021;7: e28275.  
310 doi:10.2196/28275
- 311 13. DuBose-Morris R, Coleman C, Ziniel SI, Schinasi DA, McSwain SD. Telehealth Utilization in  
312 Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Current State of Medical Provider Training. *Telemed  
313 E-Health.* 2022;28: 1178–1185. doi:10.1089/tmj.2021.0381
- 314 14. Garber K, Gustin T. Telehealth Education: Impact on Provider Experience and Adoption.  
315 *Nurse Educ.* 2022;47: 75–80. doi:10.1097/NNE.0000000000001103
- 316 15. Mulcare M, Naik N, Greenwald P, Schullstrom K, Gogia K, Clark S, et al. Advanced  
317 Communication and Examination Skills in Telemedicine: A Structured Simulation-Based  
318 Course for Medical Students. *MedEdPORTAL.* 16: 11047. doi:10.15766/mep\_2374-  
319 8265.11047
- 320 16. Cantone RE, Palmer R, Dodson LG, Biagioli FE. Insomnia Telemedicine OSCE (TeleOSCE): A  
321 Simulated Standardized Patient Video-Visit Case for Clerkship Students. *MedEdPORTAL.*  
322 15: 10867. doi:10.15766/mep\_2374-8265.10867
- 323 17. Belakovskiy A, Jones EK. Telehealth and Medical Education. *Prim Care.* 2022;49: 575–583.  
324 doi:10.1016/j.pop.2022.04.003
- 325 18. Farrell SE, Junkin AR, Hayden EM. Assessing Clinical Skills Via Telehealth Objective  
326 Standardized Clinical Examination: Feasibility, Acceptability, Comparability, and  
327 Educational Value. *Telemed E-Health.* 2022;28: 248–257. doi:10.1089/tmj.2021.0094
- 328 19. Dahmen L, Linke M, Schneider A, Kühl SJ. Medical students in their first consultation: A  
329 comparison between a simulated face-to-face and telehealth consultation to train medical  
330 consultation skills. *GMS J Med Educ.* 2023;40: Doc63. doi:10.3205/zma001645
- 331 20. Murphy E, Stein A, Pahwa A, McGuire M, Kumra T. Improvement of Medical Student  
332 Performance in Telemedicine Standardized Patient Encounters Following an Educational  
333 Intervention. *Fam Med.* 2023;55: 400–404. doi:10.22454/FamMed.2023.523442
- 334 21. Lesselroth B, Monkman H, Liew A, Palmer R, Crosby K, Kelly D, et al. Simulating  
335 Telemedicine, Medication Reconciliation, and Social Determinants: A Novel Instructional  
336 Approach to Health Systems Competencies. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2024;310: 1201–  
337 1205. doi:10.3233/SHTI231155
- 338 22. Hayden EM, Nash CJ, Farrell SE. Simulated video-based telehealth training for emergency  
339 physicians. *Front Med.* 2023;10. Available:  
340 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2023.1223048>

- 341 23. Doyle Howley L, Martindale J. The Efficacy of Standardized Patient Feedback in Clinical  
342 Teaching: A Mixed Methods Analysis. *Med Educ Online*. 2004;9: 4356.  
343 doi:10.3402/meo.v9i.4356
- 344 24. Berenson LD. Standardized Patient Feedback: Making It Work Across Disciplines. *J Allied*  
345 *Health*. 2012;41.
- 346 25. Lin EC-L, Chen S-L, Chao S-Y, Chen Y-C. Using standardized patient with immediate  
347 feedback and group discussion to teach interpersonal and communication skills to  
348 advanced practice nursing students. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2013;33: 677–683.  
349 doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2012.07.002
- 350 26. Wallach A, McCrickard M, Elias KL, Hochman K. An experiential faculty orientation to set  
351 communication standards. *Med Educ*. 2019;53: 512–513. doi:10.1111/medu.13867
- 352 27. Sartori DJ, Lakdawala V, Levitt HB, Sherwin JA, Testa PA, Zabar SR. Standardizing Quality of  
353 Virtual Urgent Care: Using Standardized Patients in a Unique Experiential Onboarding  
354 Program. *MedEdPORTAL*. 18: 11244. doi:10.15766/mep\_2374-8265.11244
- 355 28. Cruz-Panesso I, Tanoubi I, Drolet P. Telehealth Competencies: Training Physicians for a  
356 New Reality? *Healthc Basel Switz*. 2023;12: 93. doi:10.3390/healthcare12010093
- 357 29. Noronha C, Lo MC, Nikiforova T, Jones D, Nandiwada DR, Leung TI, et al. Telehealth  
358 Competencies in Medical Education: New Frontiers in Faculty Development and Learner  
359 Assessments. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2022;37: 3168–3173. doi:10.1007/s11606-022-07564-8
- 360 30. Samuels-Kalow M, Jaffe T, Zachrison K. Digital disparities: designing telemedicine systems  
361 with a health equity aim. *Emerg Med J EMJ*. 2021;38: 474–476. doi:10.1136/emered-  
362 2020-210896
- 363 31. Drossman DA, Chang L, Deutsch JK, Ford AC, Halpert A, Kroenke K, et al. A Review of the  
364 Evidence and Recommendations on Communication Skills and the Patient-Provider  
365 Relationship: A Rome Foundation Working Team Report. *Gastroenterology*. 2021;161:  
366 1670-1688.e7. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2021.07.037
- 367 32. Rising KL, Kemp M, Leader AE, Chang AM, Monick AJ, Guth A, et al. A Prioritized Patient-  
368 Centered Research Agenda to Reduce Disparities in Telehealth Uptake: Results from a  
369 National Consensus Conference. *Telemed Rep*. 2023;4: 387–395.  
370 doi:10.1089/tmr.2023.0051
- 371 33. Gustavson AM, Lewinski AA, Fitzsimmons-Craft EE, Coronado GD, Linke SE, O’Malley DM,  
372 et al. Strategies to Bridge Equitable Implementation of Telehealth. *Interact J Med Res*.  
373 2023;12: e40358. doi:10.2196/40358

- 374 34. Guizado de Nathan G, Shaw LK, Doolen J. Social Determinants of Health: A Multilingual  
375 Standardized Patient Case to Practice Interpreter Use in a Telehealth Visit. *MedEdPORTAL*  
376 *J Teach Learn Resour.* 2023;19: 11364. doi:10.15766/mep\_2374-8265.11364
- 377 35. Gaba DM. The future vision of simulation in health care. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2004;13: i2–i10.  
378 doi:10.1136/qshc.2004.009878
- 379 36. Taylor DCM, Hamdy H. Adult learning theories: Implications for learning and teaching in  
380 medical education: AMEE Guide No. 83. *Med Teach.* 2013;35: e1561–e1572.  
381 doi:10.3109/0142159X.2013.828153
- 382 37. Kolb DA. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development.* FT  
383 Press; 2014.
- 384 38. Makoul G. Essential Elements of Communication in Medical Encounters: The Kalamazoo  
385 Consensus Statement. *Acad Med.* 2001;76: 390.
- 386 39. Calhoun AW, Rider EA, Meyer EC, Lamiani G, Truog RD. Assessment of communication  
387 skills and self-appraisal in the simulated environment: feasibility of multirater feedback  
388 with gap analysis. *Simul Healthc J Soc Simul Healthc.* 2009;4: 22–29.  
389 doi:10.1097/SIH.0b013e318184377a
- 390 40. Joyce BL, Steenbergh T, Scher E. Use of the kalamazoo essential elements communication  
391 checklist (adapted) in an institutional interpersonal and communication skills curriculum. *J*  
392 *Grad Med Educ.* 2010;2: 165–169. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-10-00024.1
- 393 41. Porcerelli JH, Brennan S, Carty J, Ziadni M, Markova T. Resident Ratings of Communication  
394 Skills Using the Kalamazoo Adapted Checklist. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2015;7: 458–461.  
395 doi:10.4300/JGME-D-14-00422.1
- 396 42. Brown SD, Rider EA, Jamieson K, Meyer EC, Callahan MJ, DeBenedectis CM, et al.  
397 Development of a Standardized Kalamazoo Communication Skills Assessment Tool for  
398 Radiologists: Validation, Multisource Reliability, and Lessons Learned. *Am J Roentgenol.*  
399 2017;209: 351–357. doi:10.2214/AJR.16.17439
- 400 43. Smith TS, Watts P, Moss JA. Using Simulation to Teach Telehealth Nursing Competencies. *J*  
401 *Nurs Educ.* 2018;57: 624–627. doi:10.3928/01484834-20180921-10
- 402 44. Wong R, Ng P, Spinnato T, Taub E, Kaushal A, Lerman M, et al. Expanding Telehealth  
403 Competencies in Primary Care: A Longitudinal Interdisciplinary Simulation to Train Internal  
404 Medicine Residents in Complex Patient Care. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2020;12: 745–752.  
405 doi:10.4300/JGME-D-20-00030.1
- 406 45. Eckhoff DO, Diaz DA, Anderson M. Using Simulation to Teach Intraprofessional Telehealth  
407 Communication. *Clin Simul Nurs.* 2022;67: 39–48. doi:10.1016/j.ecns.2022.03.006

- 408 46. Beaird G, Nye C, Thacker LR. The Use of Video Recording and Standardized Patient  
409 Feedback to Improve Communication Performance in Undergraduate Nursing Students.  
410 Clin Simul Nurs. 2017;13: 176–185. doi:10.1016/j.ecns.2016.12.005



412 **Supporting Information**

413 **S1 Appendix.** Learning Objectives

414 **S2 Appendix:** Case A

415 **S3 Appendix:** Case B

416 **S4 Appendix:** Pre-Session Survey

417 **S5 Appendix:** Standardized Patient Checklist

418 **S6 Appendix:** Post-Session Survey