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BACKGROUND

- At UMMS, 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 both faculty and students.
- 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%).
- Questionnaire developed based on educational literature and reviewed by student focus group.
- Focus group assessed time to complete questionnaire, clarity of questions, & new topics.
- Questionnaire consisted of 20 items using 4-point likert scale plus 3 open-ended response questions.
- Questions based on 5 elements of an effective lecture – clarity, interaction, task orientation, enthusiasm, and organization.
- Questions based on 5 elements of an effective lecture – clarity, interaction, task orientation, enthusiasm, and organization.
- Students completed questionnaire after each lecture in 2 lectures (21 unique faculty, 33 lectures).
- 397 total questionnaires submitted, range 2-23 per lecture, mean 12 questionnaires per lecture.
- Completed questionnaires sent to faculty daily per lecture, mean 12 questionnaires per lecture.
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RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS

- Lecture Evaluation: Likert Data
  - No statistical difference between Overall mean (3.15) & Calculated mean (3.19), P=0.121
  - Lecturers given “overall” poor or fair (N=97) received range of scores on individual questions (poor - excellent).
  - Students able to pinpoint ways to improve, but also report strengths.
  - Most questions calculated/overall mean>3 (range 2.79-3.34).
  - “Used a variety of teaching methods” mean 2.79; Possible confusion of definition – students interpreted as variety of methods.
  - Per question responses left blank ranged 1-28 (mean 9).
  - Demonstrates students could complete survey
  - 28 blanks for “Responded appropriately” likely due to students needing N/A column.
  - 18-21 blanks for questions about “objectives” possibly due to student confusion of definition or ambiguity in faculty’s presentation of objectives.

- Conclusion: Majority of students rated this highly, though frequently responses to the open-ended questions asked 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.

- Lecturer Perceptions of Evaluation Method
  - Frequency in which students complete survey:
    - 33% right after lecture, 39% right after week, 28% right after 2 weeks.
  - How to divide students into groups:
    - 28% “Separated by academic years”, 25% “Other”.
  - Lecture Perceptions of Evaluation Method
    - Students like feedback on their course material, students are likely to inform faculty.

- Student Perceptions of Evaluation Method
  - An abbreviated version of this survey would be better:
    - 65% would like to receive this feedback the next day, 35% before lecture.
    - 46% would like feedback right after lecture, 3% before lecture.
  - How to divide students into groups:
    - 33% “Separated by academic years”, 25% “Other”.
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- Course Materials and Lectures Corresponded
  - 11% for Overall question
  - 60% for specific questions regarding organization and engagement.

- Conclusion: Students need to see changes implemented due to feedback.
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- Repository question, 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 feedback.
- 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.

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 analysis.
- Few faculty had repeat lectures thus unable to track how faculty use the information and students’ reactions to implementing.
- Few faculty repeated lectures thus unable to accurately gauge the usefulness of giving feedback after every lecture taught.

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 feedback.
- 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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