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BACKGROUND

- At UMMSS, pre-clinical students evaluate lecturers 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 prepared, 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 and faculty curriculum committee.
- 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.
- Focus group assessed time to complete questionnaire, clarity of questions, & new topics.
- Students completed questionnaire after each lecture -- clarity, interaction, task orientation, and enthusiasm, and organization.
- Faculty curriculum committee identified to participate after email solicitation to 250 (40%).
- 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.
- 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 or topics.
- 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.

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 lectures 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 or topics.
- 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.

Faculty Perception of Evaluation Method

- An abbreviated version of this survey would be better.

Student Perception of Evaluation Method

- How often would this feedback be helpful?

- Lecture Evaluation: Open-Ended Responses

- 5 Major Themes:
  - Clarity, Interaction, Task Orientation, Organization, Overall.
  - 3-4 minor themes per major theme.
  - 60% for specific questions regarding organization and engagement.
  - 10% for Overall question.

- Range of examples:
  - Clarity: Craving for Clinical Correlations.
  - Interaction: Engaged & Enthusiastic.
  - Excellent infectious enthusiasm.
  - "Great enthusiasm! Makes me want to continue this class."
  - Seemed excited to see us and lecture to us. Seemed like he wanted to be here.

- Interaction: Delivery suggestions for improvement.
  - "Lecture was extremely dry – like listening to a textbook."
  - "Please don’t talk to the screen."
  - "Lecturer seemed disininterested in being here himself."

- Sample of Faculty comments:
  - "It was very helpful and will certainly impact my lecture next year."
  - "From experience I know it is hard to please all learners, so the more input we have across the time, the better we can judge how to present our lectures. Also this is a VERY helpful for establishing a teaching portfolio."

- Sample of Student comments:
  - "...the post-exam feedback is too distant to be very useful and couldn’t be used to improve the course in real time."
  - "Some professors really responded to the comments, which made me feel that they really did care about our learning."

- Conclusion:
  - Students need to see value in evaluating each lecturer; in intrinsic reasons when courses are well prepared, materials’ relevance clear and their teachers are enthusiastic and engaged.

LIMITATIONS

- Recruited 34 students though lecture attendance and thus response rate varied, some lecturers 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 summary statistics.
- 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.
  - Frequency in which students complete questionnaire.
  - Format in which faculty & students respond.
  - 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 lectures.
  - Investigating piloting this method of feedback for clinical years’ lectures.
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