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BACKGROUND

AT UMass, pre-clinical students evaluate lectures weeks to months after delivery which may impact recall and evaluation. Delays in faculty receiving feedback may impact their ability to institute change. Sampling can reduce evaluation demands on students yet preserve reliability and validity. Literature shows students are motivated for intrinsic reasons when: courses are well planned, materials’ relevance clear and their teachers are enthusiastic and engaged.

METHODS

• 34 second year students (goal of 25-30) self-identified to participate after email solicitation to 140 (24.2%) identified to participate after email solicitation to point likert scale plus 3 open-ended response questions
• Lecturers given overall poor or fair (N=97) received range of lectures on individual questions (poor - excellent)
• Students able to pinpoint ways to improve, but also report strengths

RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS

Lecture Evaluation: Likert Data

Course Materials and Lecture Correspondences

85% would like to receive this feedback trended over time;
48% would like feedback right after lecture,
35% before lecture,
39% right after & follow-up

Conclusion: Majority of students rated this highly, though frequently responses to the open-ended questions noted need for improvement. Thus, correspondence of materials is impacted for many students, and there's dissonance between lecture and course material. Students are likely to inform faculty.

How often would this feedback be helpful?

An abbreviated version of this survey would be better

Student Perception of Evaluation Method

Conclusions: Counter to our hypothesis, 50% of students did not want an abbreviated version. More specific feedback may be seen as more likely to instigate change.

LIMITATIONS

• Recruited 34 students though lecture attendance and thus response rate varied, some lectures had as few as 2 or 3 responses.
• Students who volunteered may have more interest in giving feedback
• N/A was not included as an option for the likert scale portion of the questionnaire
• Faculty received data in raw format, no statistical summary statistics.
• Few faculty had repeat lectures thus unable to track how feedback influences the student experience and question in next year & retain feedback

NEXT STEPS

• Revising questionnaire, specifically adding N/A option and removing overall questions
• Adapting questionnaire to be online
• Planning implementation of questionnaire in pre-clinical years, determining:
  - Number of students needed
  - How to divide students into groups
  - Frequency in which students complete questionnaire
  - Frequency & format in which faculty & students receive data
• Considering a system where faculty could provide a personal response to an anonymous evaluator
• Evaluating possibility of providing faculty ability to color questions for their lecture
• Investigating piloting this method of feedback for clinical years’ lectures
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