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CTO info presented is from course evals done this academic year

- 73/74 students responded, a 99% participation rate!
- **Course director:** Rand S. Swenson, M.D., Ph.D.
- **Course faculty:**
  - Laura Kersting Barre, M.D.
  - Brian Catlin, M.D.
  - Arnold S. Fabricant, M.D.
  - Virginia T. Lyons, Ph.D.
  - J. Michael Price, Ph.D.
  - Mara Rendi, Ph.D.
  - Rand S. Swenson, M.D., Ph.D.
What were the two best things about this course?

• 1 and 2: The professors - this group of professors was the best!
• The patient of the day sections and the DMS CTO website with the lab slides on it.
• Very straightforward teaching, good correlation with HAE
What two things would you suggest that we do or change next year to improve this course?

- Do away with microscopes
- Fewer slides per lecture and less extraneous (non-quizzable) detail
- Remove ambiguous quiz questions
- Integrate it with the molecular aspects of our Physiology course and perhaps even look at synergies with our Biochemistry course
Cont.

- Provide practices quizzes to gain a better idea of what type of questions will be on the quizzes
- Final exam seemed more difficult than quizzes by a lot. Also, more labeling of the histology slides on the lectures.
- Add a couple thought questions in lectures every 30 min or so on material just covered to help us stay focused.
Comments on the usefulness of the Audience Response System (ARS).

• They are great!
• It basically just scared me into studying
• is good for calming my nerves
• This was a fun and good way to get some fast reviewing in before quizzes - it is one of the few (too few!) interactive parts of the curriculum.
Comments on labs and CTO website

• The student to teacher ratio was great.
• The labs weren't as fun at times since staring into the microscope for long periods of time hurt my eyes
• Labs are greatly added by that website which points out what we need to look for.
• I think DMS should consider switching to virtual histology only. Many medical schools are doing this and now I understand why!
I used the CTO Webpage extensively (I found the "Course Website" more helpful than the "Virtual Histology Website) during lab, for review of lecture/lab, and for quiz preparation. I found it to be an extremely valuable resource for learning histology - perhaps the most useful part of the entire course!

I hate technology, the less laptop action, the better.
Most comments indicated helping most with the knowledge competency.

“This course expanded my knowledge base tremendously. The professionalism of the instructors provided great modeling as well”
scale of 1 to 5, 1 being “poor” and 5 being “excellent”

• overall satisfaction (3.68)
• usefulness of lectures (3.88)
• quality and effectiveness of lecture notes (3.87)
• intellectual challenge (3.82)
• basic competency in this field (3.96)
• effectiveness of the syllabus and clarity of expectations (4.10)
• usefulness of the text (Wheater’s Functional History) (2.90)
• Each of these scores was above last year’s mean scores and most above other course Year I averages
• all lecturers received scores in the “good” to “very good” range
• clarity of quiz and exam questions (3.29)
• effectiveness of the lab manual (3.46)
• availability of lab instructors (4.74) !!!
• electronic resources (4.48) !!!
• Competencies: working knowledge (4.21), clinical skills (3.33), professionalism (3.11), communication (3.11), life-long learning (3.22) and insights into working in the broader health care system (2.82)
Summary

• CTO is a well organized and enjoyed course by Year I students
• Highlights – the profs, electronic resources (website, ARS, virtual microscopy)
• Future directions and Course Director’s perspective