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Physiology in 1\textsuperscript{st} year

- **Cardiovascular**
  - Lecturers: Dr Nattie, Dr Daubenspeck, Dr Katz
  - Small groups
- **Respiratory**
  - Lecturers: Dr Daubenspeck, Dr Leiter, Dr Bartlett, Dr Darnall
  - Small groups
- **Endocrine**
  - Dr. Galton, Dr. St. Germain, Dr. A. Fejes-Toth, Dr. Guyre, Dr. North, Dr. Wira
  - Small groups
- **Renal**
  - Dr Stanton, Dr G. Fejes-Toth
  - Small Groups
Cardiovascular - Stats

- 33/84 respondents – 39%

**General Overview**
- Student satisfaction INCREASED, ABOVE YEAR I MEAN
- Effectiveness of lectures: very good
- Pace and Density: About right
- Intellectual challenge / helping to gain mastery: very good – excellent
- Text: very good (INCREASED, ABOVE YEAR 1 MEAN for texts)

**Lecturers:**
- Very good to excellent, and good to very good

**Small Group Conferences**
- “very good” to “excellent,” (substantially above the Year I mean)
- The right amount of time (79%)
Cardiovascular - Stats

- **Other Resources**
  - thought questions: very good (inc)
  - hemodynamics computer tutorial: good (dec)
  - cardiac cycle computer program: fair to good (dec -0.86)
  - cv mechanics computer tutorial: good (dec)
  - correlation clinics (septic shock, cv demo): very good (dec)

- **Exams, Quizzes, Grading Policy**
  - clearly explained (syllabus and in early lectures)
  - appropriateness of weighting of grade: very good (inc)
  - ability of quiz and exams to reflect course content: very good (inc)
Cardiovascular - Stats

- **Core Competencies**
  - very good - excellent
    - “knowledge base”
  - good – very good
    - “clinical skills”
    - “professionalism”
    - “life-long learning,”
    - “communication,”
    - “working in the broader health care practice.”
Cardiovascular Narrative

- **General**
  - Very positive
  - “the lecturers were outstanding and presented excellent, engaging thorough questions that helped me learn the material.”
  - “The professors were very involved with the students. I loved how they knew our names and were very eager to help us in any way. They are incredibly responsive to email and to questions.”
Cardiovascular Narrative

- **Lectures, Lecturers, Conferences:**
  - pre-lecture CV tutorial was not popular.
    - “Don’t teach the CV cycle as a tutorial that students had to do on their own. It's a very important lecture, and I felt that I struggled to understand those concepts and the ones that built on them because I didn't get a good foundation by going through that lecture on my own.”
  - a more thorough overview and review of terms
    - “Provide more context; i.e. rather than jump right in and start explaining a concept, take a few minutes to explain why we're looking at this concept (e.g. what we're going to be using it for later on).”
  - clinical correlations, and audiovisual movies: extremely useful learning tool
  - very positive about the small group conferences.
    - “The small group conferences - they really helped me organize the information and review key concepts.”
Cardiovascular Narrative

- **Exams, Quizzes and Grading:**
- some concerned about questions being too similar to past quizzes
- more questions on quizzes – less points per question
CV – Interesting narratives

- 2 best things
  - **small groups**, professors (esp Dr N), problem solving, mp3 files, practice quizzes

- 2 things to change/improve
  - **nothing**, clearer concepts, more context, list of terms, label graphs, EKGs, no computer based lecture (x6), change CV tutorial, change simulation, fewer arrows, cap # of slides, less monotone, more detailed notes

- Integration
  - well integrated
  - I'd love to see the whole first year curriculum designed around physiology- HAE and CTO would benefit from better explanations of what those cells and muscles actually do
CV – Interesting narratives

- Lecturers – not reviewed here
- Attendance:
  - 21 did not respond,
  - 8/9 attended ALL
- Conferences:
  - rotated (13)
  - did not rotate (13)
    - enjoyed diff leaders
    - resented rotators (too big)
CV – Interesting narratives

- Suggestions for better use of laptops
  - don’t do it / less laptops (x6)
  - thought ques = live poll
  - electronic Wiggers diagram
  - “The CV simulation is a good start, but...I don't really know. “
Respiratory Physiology
Respiratory - Stats

- 27/84 respondents – 32%

General Overview
- Overall satisfaction: **good** – very good (slight dec, below mean)
- Overall usefulness of lectures: **good** – very good (dec, below mean)
- Quality of lecture notes: good – **very good** (dec, below mean)
- Text (Hlastala & Berger): **fair** (dec, below mean)
- Intellectual challenge: good – **very good** (dec, below mean)
- Acquiring competency in field: good – **very good** (slight dec, above mean)
- Scheduling and clarity of expectations: good – **very good** (dec, above mean)
Respiratory - Stats

- **Lectures**
  - overall effectiveness / notes / learning environment: “good” to “very good”, and “very good” to “excellent” (some dec, below mean)

- **Small Group Conferences**
  - usefulness: “very good” to “excellent” (dec, above mean)
  - amount of time: **just right** (70%) (26% too little)
  - conference leaders: all between “good” and “excellent” for effectiveness.
Respiratory - Stats

- **Correlation Clinic and the Borwell Lab Demo**
  - Correlation clinic: “good” to “very good”
  - Lab demo at Borwell as “good.”
  - Amount of time: right amount (67%, 23% wanted more)

- **Exams, Quizzes, Grading Policy**
  - grading policy: *presented clearly* / explained / clarified
  - appropriate weight of final: good – *very good* (inc)
  - reflected course content: good – *very good* (inc, above mean)
  - clarity of ques: good – *very good* (inc, at mean)
Respiratory - Stats

- **Core competencies**
  - “good” – “very good”
    - working knowledge
    - clinical skills
    - professionalism
    - communication
  - “fair” – “good”
    - insights into healthcare system
    - life-long learning
In general, positive
- Well integrated
  - “learning about the material while learning about doing pulmonary exams in On-Doctoring.”
- Favorite parts of the course
  - the clinical correlations, small groups and lab demonstrations.
  - “I would like to see more lab demonstrations, clinical correlations, and interactive activities.”
  - “The clinical correlations lecture was GREAT!”
  - “They (small groups) are a very good system and need to be used more!”

But, some mixed feelings about the Lab Demo in Borwell.
- for some, very useful and effective in integrating the material.
- for others, it “would have been more useful if it had lecture notes.”
- for some, room size was “too small for all of us to fit inside”
Respiratory - Narrative

- **Requests for changes:**
  - More preparation and background (esp content and vocabulary) “for the labs and demonstrations would enable the students to get more out of them.”
  - “A better text would also be very helpful.”
  - Confusion with the terminology.
  - “Attempt to avoid restating things in multiple terminologies, or analogies. I feel like the main points of the lectures are sometimes not obvious.”
Respiratory – interesting narratives

● 2 best things:
  ● variety of learning environments, clinical correlations, conferences, lecture notes

● 2 things to change:
  ● more small groups (?optional), more background / terminology, more interactive activities!, a little slower please, lab demo (more space, study notes)

● Lecturers: not reviewed here
Respiratory – interesting narratives

- Attending lectures:
  - attempted to attend all (7/12), too dense (2) vs too slow (3)
- Integration: very well done
  - “This course was REALLY well integrated. It was so fun to learn how the lung worked as we saw the lung in HAE and then microscopically in CTO. Very well done! “
- Conferences: great!
  - esp kudos for Dr N, L, and B
  - “Don't let one student's confusion dominate a conference”
Respiratory – interesting narratives

- Grading
  - fair, prev quizzes helpful, more questions
- Lab demo
  - excellent ↔ not helpful, lecture notes, location
- Integrated audio w/ lectures
  - yes (13) vs no (5)
  - ? dictated, speed up or slow down?
- Laptops: less (3/6), live poll (2/6)
- Strengths: little constructive feedback
Summary
Summary

- Well taught, well integrated courses
  - some lecture styles consistently preferred
- **Small groups very important to students**
- Areas of possible change
  - more background / terminology definitions
  - Respiratory text was only rated fair
- Other resources
  - ambivalence about technology
    - incl laptops in class, interactive powerpoints and simulation
- What about the SILENT majority
  - only 39% and 32% responded
Previous response rates

- CV
  - 73% (2004, #62) → 62% (2005, #54) → 39% (#33)

- Respiratory
  - 70% (2004, 59) → 60% (2005, 49) → 32% (#27)

- Yearly response rates
  - 2005/06
    - Respiratory Physiology: 49/86 Respondents, or 60% of the Year One Class
    - Cardiovascular Physiology: 54 Respondents, or 62.8% of the Year One Class
    - Renal Physiology: 46/86 Respondents, or 53.5% of the Year I Class
    - Endocrine Physiology: 55 Respondents, or 65% of the Year I Class
  
  - 2004/05
    - Respiratory Physiology: 59 Respondents, or 70%
    - Cardiovascular Physiology: 62 Respondents, or 73% of the Year One Class
    - Renal Physiology: 60 Respondents, or 71% of the Year I Class
    - Endocrine Physiology: 55 Respondents, or 65% of the Year I Class