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Microbiology in DMS I

6 weeks of Immunology lectures, 3 conferences
• Immunology lecturers
  – Charles Sentman, PhD  Course Director
  – Paul Guyre, PhD
  – Randolph Noelle, PhD

6 weeks of Virology lectures, 1 lab session
• Virology lecturers
  – Robert Bzik, PhD  Course Director
  – Elmer Pfefferkorn, PhD
  – Edward Usherwood, PhD

12 weeks of Bacteriology (Spring term)
IMMUNOLOGY
General Immunology Statistics

• Response Rate
  – 57% (42/73 students)

• Overview (Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent)
  – Overall satisfaction: Good (below 0.38)
  – Pace and Density: 62% responded “about right,” 33% responded “too rushed, too dense”
  – Value of attending lectures: Good (below)
General Immunology Stats, Con’d

- Quality/effectiveness of lecture notes: Good (below 0.32)
- Intellectual Challenge: Very Good (average)
- Basic Competency in Field: Good-Very Good (below 0.44)
- Overall Effectiveness of Syllabus: Good-Very Good (below)
- Texts
  - Abbas: Very Good (above 0.38)
  - Levinson: Good-Very Good (above 0.27)
Immunology Statistics: Lectures

• Faculty
  – Lectures: Good–Very Good (average)
    • Dr. Noelle’s rating (Very Good) in this category increased from last year’s (by 0.94)
  – Lecture notes: Good–Very Good (average)
Immunology Statistics: Conferences

- Amount of time devoted: 74% responded “just right”
- Content and Usefulness: Good (below 0.6)
- Effectiveness of Small Group leaders (one Good, all others Very Good-Excellent)
Immunology Statistics: Resources and Grading

• Ability of quiz and exam questions to reflect the content/emphasis of course: Good (below 0.42)
• Clarity of questions: Good (average)
• Effectiveness of Blackboard practice questions: Very Good (above 0.57)
• Overall usefulness of Blackboard: Very Good (average)
• Effectiveness of Levinson questions: Very Good
Immunology Narratives:
General Comments

• Relevance:
  – “This course was fascinating - and for the first time since I began medical school I felt like I was actually learning something relevant to my future patients!!” (07-08)

• Texts:
  – “The texts were awesome!” (06-07)
  – “Abbas text had very good summarizing illustrations” (06-07)

• Transplant lecture:
  – “The lectures on transplantation and cancer were very useful in highlighting the clinical significance of immunology.” (07-08)
Immunology Narratives: Course Structure

• “I think the lectures moved too quickly and we did not have the opportunity to internalize each concept before moving on to the next... I did not feel as though I understood all the material until the final exam.” (07-08)

• “[The professors] need to structure the lectures in such a way that the core mechanisms between immunological players are emphasized/repeated and that a foundation of basic principals is created upon which to build the rest of our knowledge.” (06-07)
Immunology Narratives: Course Detail

• “The lecture notes could be a little more succinct. Both the slides and notes are incredibly detailed and wordy... I think that trying to present a little less information in a clearer manner would lead to a better outcome.” (06-07)
Immunology Narratives: Logistics

• Small group:
  – “The conference groups were great!” (06-07)
  – “I think small group time would be better spent covering topics discussed in lecture” (07-08)

• Compatibility:
  – PLEASE make sure the powerpoints/lecture notes are PC compatible (so images do not display ‘need quicktime decompressor to view’)! Have a book of lecture notes like the Virology part of the course” (07-08)

• Audio files:
  – “Please put the audio online” (07-08, also a common comment in 06-07)
Immunology Summary

• Response rate fairly low (57%)
• Ratings were lower than year one averages, but were slightly higher than last year
• Texts very popular
• Small groups popular, some students wanted to see more focus on course content
• Lectures and notes too detailed, difficult to discern major themes
VIROLOGY
Virology Statistics

• Response Rate
  – 58% (43/73 students)

• Overview (Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent)
  – Overall satisfaction: Good-Very Good (average, up 0.95 from last year)
  – Pace and Density: 89% responded “about right”
  – Value of attending lectures: Fair-Good (below 0.63)
Virology Statistics, Con’d

• Quality/effectiveness of lecture notes:
  Very Good (above 0.66)

• Intellectual Challenge: Good (below 0.45)

• Basic Competency in Field: Good-Very Good (average)

• Overall Effectiveness of Syllabus: Very Good (above)

• Texts
  – Gilligan: Fair-Good (only 3 people used this text)
  – Levinson: Good-Very Good
Virology Statistics: Lectures

• Faculty Lectures:
  – Wide spectrum: Good, Very Good-Excellent
  – Dr. Pfefferkorn was very well received
  – All professors increased ratings compared to last year (esp. Dr. Bzik by 1.11)

• Lecture notes: Very Good for all professors (above by at least 0.24)
Virology Statistics: Grading

• Clarity of grading policy: 64% clearly presented in syllabus, 28% explained clearly early in course

• Ability of quiz and exam questions to reflect the content/emphasis of course: Good (below)

• Clarity of questions: Good (below 0.26)
Virology Statistics: Resources

• Effectiveness of practice questions at end of notes: Very Good (above 0.47)

• Effectiveness of Levinson review questions: Very Good

• Effectiveness of Levinson case studies: Good-Very Good (38% of respondents used these)
Virology Statistics: Lab

• Overall usefulness in providing clarity to virology experimental basis: Good (below 0.77)
Core Competencies

• **Working Knowledge**: Good-Very Good (average)
• **Clinical Skills**: Good-Very Good (average)
• **Professionalism**: Good (below 0.28)
• **Communication**: Fair-Good (below 0.46)
• **Life-long Learning**: Good (average)
• **Insight to health care system**: Good (average)
Virology Narratives: General Comments

• “I enjoyed thinking about epidemiology and ways to prevent/contain disease outbreak.”
• “Best of all, I feel like my virology knowledge will be important in my career as a physician. Because its relevance was tangible, it was easy to motivate myself to study.”
• “The pre-printed notes were great--they really helped a lot in listening to the lectures and paying attention instead of typing notes into a computer”
Virology Narratives: Grading and Exams

• “I felt the questions Virology asked were much too detailed and not consistent with questions in Levinson. Do we need to know Virology in that kind of detail? Would knowing the details now really help us on the Boards over a year from now?”

• “Some questions were worded a bit oddly.”

• “Remove those questions everybody hates (you know which ones). The antiquated method of A=1,2,3 B=2,4 C=all. Kudos for changing it for the second quiz.”
Virology Narratives: Notes

• “The text is just right. I’ve said it before, but the notes were TERRIFIC! Great job with the notes.”

• “The lecture notes and tables were very thorough and definitely helpful when it came time to study for quizzes and exams.”

• “Standardize the notes. Details were buried in the text and it was hard to navigate the stream-of-consciousness-style of writing.”

• “The notes were great, but could use some editing. They could be repetitive at times, and occasionally contradicted what we heard in lecture.”

• “I would like there to be explanations to the practice quizzes in the notes.”
Virology Narratives: Lectures

• “Dr. Pfefferkorn: NEVER quit teaching. We love you!”
• “Dr. Pfefferkorn was an amazing lecturer--he presented very interesting stories/case studies that really illustrated the material.”
• “I enjoyed Dr. Bzik's last lecture on rabies and smallpox. I learned a lot from it. I also liked how he taught us about the reasons why smallpox was able to be eradicated. I liked how he told us why the flu was going around right now because it was informative and relevant.”
• “Drs. Bzik and Usherwood did a good job with some lectures such as Herpes and HIV. Some lectures did feel like verbatim readings from the notes.”
• “Dr. Bzik and Dr. Usherwood’s organization was good… But I felt at times that they were simply reading to us out of the lecture notes.” (06-07)
Virology Narratives: Lab

• “The lab was a good attempt at trying to get us to understand basic diagnostic techniques, but it could have been made more interesting with use of a case study or other clinical examples.”
• “It was a good short lab. I finally understood the techniques that were mentioned in lectures.”
• “The lab wasn't that useful. They would have accomplished the same objective if they had shown us all of the demonstrations in slides.”
• “Lab was not terribly useful because of the timing.”
Virology Summary

• Response rate fairly low (58%)
• Course satisfaction was below year one mean
• Lecture notes and course expectations were clear and well-received
• Lecture attendance
• Question format: board style questions are much more popular