

NEUROSCIENCE MODULE – EVALUATION SUMMARY

Course Director – Dr. Robin Lester

Clinical Co-Director – Dr. Anthony Nicholas

STRENGTHS

Module goals and objectives :

1. Good job at outlining goals and objectives
 - a. Need to add an objective relating to Evidence Based Medicine which was taught in the course.
2. Integration of basic science and clinical medicine
3. Well organized

Components of course:

1. Facilitated learning
2. Good correspondence between module material and expected board content
3. Good variety of resources – lectures, small groups, labs, computer-based resources
 - a. Good balance of diverse teaching methods and assessment
4. Neurology small group sessions rated very highly by students
 - a. LCME urges self-initiated learning by students and the student led small group sessions provided students with this opportunity
 - b. These student led small group sessions also fulfilled the LCME requirement for providing a way to evaluate students problem solving skills, clinical reasoning skills, and communication skills
 - c. Good model for other modules
5. Labs including virtual gross labs were thought to be very helpful by students
6. Exams – testing material taught and tested understanding
7. Patient presentations
8. Integration of a variety of themes throughout the module

Faculty:

1. Organizing module activities and materials
2. Well prepared lecturers/preceptors
3. Responding to students concerns
4. Overall lecture evaluations - slightly higher than the mean. Only 2 lecturers fell below the mean rating of 3 (meets expectations)
5. Small group preceptors – on par with other modules (rated highly satisfactory or excellent)

Learning outcomes: (Student ratings in comparison to other modules)

1. Understanding concepts – 39% versus 32% for other modules
2. Faculty quality – excellent 53% versus 34%
3. Overall quality – outstanding 36% versus 17%
 - Good 53% versus 36%Mean rating 4.2 (average 3.5 for other modules)

Nominal Group Technique Results – Most Helpful

1. Small group sessions
2. Morning lectures

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Course content:

1. Some overview of Psychology. Students felt like they needed more Biopsychology for USMLE Step I
2. 76% lecture - need to establish what can be taught in small group sessions
3. Lack of clarity over definition of mandatory versus non-mandatory sessions
4. Lack of integration of head and neck anatomy/radiology/neurosurgery
5. Behavioral Science – lots of scheduling changes
 - Lecturers changed
 - Times changed
 - Length of lectures changed
6. Behavioral Science small groups – too many journal articles. Many of the journal articles felt to be beyond their level of understanding. Students felt like they had too much material to review prior to the sessions

Faculty

1. Small group preceptors slow to complete evaluations
2. Lack of willingness of lecturers to use ARS

ARS

1. Need consistency
2. Required in all lectures

Assessment

1. Rated poorly on feedback - however students were unaware of the ability to review the questions that they missed on exams which is now incorporated into the modules
2. Exams – need for more USMLE type questions.
 - More concept driven, more clinical vignettes

Nominal Group Technique Results – Recommendations for Improvement

1. Redo Behavioral Science – especially small groups
2. See test questions they missed
3. Tests should be taken on one day