



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

EUGIM

European Education Program
for Gender Medicine

Evaluation of the 2011 Module 2 on Gender Medicine - Additional

Sz. Adam, Z. Cserhati, M. Kopp

Semmelweis University,
Institute of Behavioural Sciences
September, 2011.

Funding Disclaimer

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Project Number: 502432-LLP-1-DE-ERASMUS-ECDEM / Grant Agreement Number: 2009 - 3387 / 001-001

Contents

Contents	2
1. Introduction	3
2. EUGIM Module 2 Gender Medicine – Additional	4
2.1 Development of educational material	4
2.2 Structure of Module 2 in Budapest	5
2.3 Participants	5
3. Evaluation	5
3.1 Evaluation forms	6
3.2 Student evaluations	6
3.3 Teacher evaluations	9
4. Annexes	11

1. Introduction

In this report, we describe the evaluation of EUGIM Modul2 Gender Medicine - Additional. We start with a short introduction and the aims of Modul 2. Next, we elaborate on the organization and participants in Budapest. Results of the evaluation of the Modul 2 are presented in chapter 3.

Partners from several European universities – Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin-Charité, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Medizinische Universität Innsbruck, Maastricht University, Semmelweis University, Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre, and Karolinska Institutet - have started this Erasmus Project EUGIM which aims to develop a flexible module for European universities, “Gendermedicine (GM)”.

In September 2011, the Modul 2 Gender Medicine - Additional was held in Budapest. In accordance with the Quality Assurance System developed for the EUGIM project we aimed to

1. Evaluate the educational process including teaching staff performance
2. Evaluate the course content by student evaluations
3. Evaluate the organization of the course including facilities.

2. EUGIM Module 2 Gender Medicine - Additional

Aim of the EUGIM project is to develop two modules in gender medicine, each representing 4 ECTS. Together, these two modules will constitute a course in gender medicine that could be implemented in different Bachelor and Master Programmes in biomedical and medical curricula.

Modul 2 aims that students will learn to grasp the fundamental principles and scientific standards of gender-specific medicine in all medical disciplines (specializations).

Students will familiarize themselves with the evidence-based aspects of gender-specific research. They will learn to recognize the lack of data on gender-specific aspects of research and know what research focus is necessary for gender medicine purposes.

After completing the modules, students will be able to integrate gender-specific knowledge in their daily work with patients and take consideration of gender and sex differentiation in scientific research. The module is elemental part of the PhD education of Semmelweis University, Budapest. 2 credit points were awarded to students upon successful exam on this package.

2.1. Development of education material

In this Master Module, we aim at providing knowledge of sex/ gender aspects in 8 selected medical disciplines, creating gender awareness in medicine and give the possibility for networking by sharing knowledge with you.

The second module is to present additional clinical disciplines the wide-ranging field of Gender Medicine in one short course offering a broad but specific overview.

As the first step, the most relevant disciplines from the aspect of crucial sex and gender issues were identified. These fields/ areas of research are nephrology, eating disorders, haematology and oncology, sleep disturbances, clinical pharmacology, gastroenterology, prevention, hepatology, anthropology, immunology and rheumatology, as well as infectious diseases, inflammation.

2.2. *Structure of the Module 2 in Budapest*

The Modul2 took place in Budapest, in September 2011. The e-learning materials were placed in a blackboard environment by the time the event started. The detailed agenda/ programme can be seen at Annex I.

The following lectures were given: Introductory topic on *Gender and health in a changing society*, Gender in Nephrology, Eating disorders, Haematology and Oncology, Sleep Disturbances, Clinical Pharmacology, Gastroenterology, Prevention, Hepatology, Anthropology, Immunology and Rheumatology, as well as Infectious Diseases, Inflammation.

2.3. *Participants*

The Module 2 attendance was made by participants of various academic degrees and professional backgrounds. There were 14 participants during the event of which 8 are PhD students. Here, the information as provided for 14 participants is presented.

Academic degree

The participants provided the following data on their educational backgrounds: MD (1); MD - PhD-student (5); Psychology – PhD-student (2); Economics - PhD-student (1); Other PhD student (3) and no entry (2).

3. Evaluation of Module 2

The main purpose of the evaluation was to assess the quality of Modul 2 according the developed system of quality assurance, in order to enhance the course content, comprehensibility, flexibility and informative aspects.

Evaluation forms

We developed forms for students and forms for teachers (see Annex II and III). Forms designed for students contained Likert-type questions (do not agree = 1 to strongly agree = 3) as well as open questions.

Students were asked to fill in 25 questions on educational process, course content, facilities and assessment. Open questions has gone into details on learning materials and course organization including suggestions for change/ improvement.

Teacher forms consisted of 11 questions, pertaining to the educational process, course content, evaluation of facilities and assessment. In addition, there was room for additional remarks, as well as an optional field for the name of the teacher.

Both students and teachers were asked to fill out the evaluation forms. Out of all (14 in total) students attending Modul 2, 7 forms were returned. These students answered most questions on the evaluation form. Six teacher forms were returned, 2 of those were anonymous.

Student evaluations

As regards the open questions, we asked for which lectures were most instructive and least instructive, and we asked the same question for patient cases.

The first open question was which lectures with a maximum of two the participant would rate as **most instructive** concerning the content of the Modul2. The following lectures were reported: Introduction (3 times); Prevention (5 times); Nephrology (2 times); Eating disorders (1 time); Sleep Disturbances (1 time); Clinical Pharmacology (1 time); Infection Diseases (1 time).

Second question was which lectures (max 2) the student would rate as **least instructive** concerning the content of the Modul2. The results were as follows: Gastroentreology (2 times); Hepatology (3 times); Prevention (1 time); Clinical Pharmacology (1 time); Haematology and Oncology (2 times).

For the question which **clinical patient case** would be rated as **most instructive** the results were: Haematology and Oncology (6 times); All (1 times). The question on which **clinical patient case** the student would rate as **least instructive**, the answers were: Haematology and Oncology (1 time); None (6 times).

Aspects and elements that were mentioned as **missing** from the contents of this Modul2 were the following: 'More cases'; 'Maybe, I missed psychiatric topic from the course. It could be interesting the difference between men and women in an aspect like psychiatric'; 'Neurology topics' and 'More patient cases' (2 times) as well as 'I could suggest a bit more focus on gender related issues in each topic'.

Participants were also asked what they would like to see **changed** in following editions of the Modul2. The answers were: 'Mabe it could be helpful to offer the teachers support of „Gender experts” to prepare their lectures. Like a „teach the teacher” concept. Because it is not easy for most of the teachers to find any good gender/sex data'; ' I think, it was a well organised course. Topics were instructed to lectures (more or less)'; ' I would like to see more gender dates, and more patient cases'; and 'More gender differences'; as well as 'More topics, more foreign guests'.

Additional remarks from the students:

- We should think about how to motivate students, professionals... taking part in our lectures, modules, summer schools and so on.
- It was very good that it was in one block! You should not change it

These 4 days were really interesting for me. I got new informations, datas and new aspects of medicine which I think very important.

Below the overall student evaluation form inputs can be seen specifically linked to educational process:

Educational Process	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	Do not agree	%	Agree	%	Strongly agree	%
Question 1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	0	0%	4	57%	3	43%
Question 2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	0	0%	5	71%	2	29%
Question 3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	0	0%	3	43%	4	57%
Question 4	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	0%	2	29%	5	71%
Question 5	1	2	N/A	1	0	2	2						
Question 6	2	5	N/A	0	2	2	3						
Question 7	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	0	0%	3	43%	4	57%
Question 8	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	0%	2	29%	5	71%
Question 9	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	Good	29%			Excellent	71%

As an summary, the following conclusions can be made from the data that was provided by students: overall scoring on the educational process was 100% favorable (considering both agree and strongly agree favourable) with the following split indicated below:

Overall Scoring on Educational Process:	
0%	Do not agree
45%	Agree
55%	Strongly Agree

Regarding the overall Module 2 evaluation, the assessment indicated high satisfaction, as results look the following:

Overall Module2 Assessment:	
0%	Not acceptable
0%	Poor
29%	Good
71%	Excellent

Teacher evaluations

This section describes the data from the teacher forms. As regards to the education process, **Modul 2 as a whole** was experienced very positively by the teachers. The teachers mentioned the following aspects: It is a very important and highly neglected topic in medical education; Good; Excellent (2 times); Very good initiative! Gender medicine is a challenging field.

As regards to their **own lectures**, teachers mentioned the following: It seems the students responded well to the approach (giving them clear take-home messages, without going into complex details); Good (2 times); I think the topic is very interesting nowadays, it was good; It was very interactive, motivating event with many important new aspects and The students were enthusiastic, they had continuous interest.

None teachers attended any **lectures of their colleagues**.

The teachers assessed the **organization** of the Modul 2 as follows: Excellent. I've got everything; It is very good and interesting; Excellent; The lectures are high quality lectures on the basis of expertise of the lecturers; Well organised.

On the question what can be **improved** in the next edition of Modul 2, the teachers gave the following answers: Nothing; I think: it is O.K; More practice; To reach those people who would be interested.

The evaluation of whether **Modul 2 in general and their lecture in particular was tailored to the level of previous knowledge** of the participants. The teachers commented the following way: My impression is that the students found the module to be adequate to their knowledge level; I think that was interactive, right tailored; Yes (3 times).

Whether their own lecture was tailored to the previous knowledge of participants, the answers were as follows: It has been adequately tailored and yes (4 times).

Suggestions for **improvement** were: We should do better promotion – more participants needed (esp. men); Would be good to know what kind of specialty of the student have?; I have no suggestions, it is excellent; More participants can be an item to improve

The **facilities** were positively evaluated: Very good, OK, These were appropriate, excellent (2 times).

As regards to the **final assessment**, the teachers commented that it was: Good (2 times), 'It was well organised' and 'It was ideal'.

Annex1

Courses' Schedules & Venues

Monday, September 05	Wednesday, September 07
09.00 Introduction M. Kopp, Budapest	09.00 Haematology & Oncology M. Hochleitner, Innsbruck
10.30 Coffee Break	10.30 Coffee Break
11.00 Nephrology A. Fekete, Budapest	11.00 Haematology & Oncology M. Hochleitner, Innsbruck
12.30 Lunch Break	11.45 Clinical pharmacology Gy. Soos, Budapest
13.30 Nephrology A. Fekete, Budapest	12.30 Lunch Break
15.00 Coffee Break	13.30 Clinical pharmacology Gy. Soos, Budapest
15.15 Eating disorders F. Tury, Budapest	15.00 Coffee Break
	15.15 Sleep disturbances* R. Zoller, Budapest
Tuesday, September 06	Thursday, September 08
09.00 Gastroenterology L. Herszenyi, Budapest	09.00 Anthropology A. Zana, Budapest
10.30 Coffee Break	10.30 Coffee Break
11.00 Prevention M. Hochleitner, Innsbruck	11.00 Imm + Rheumatology I. Brankovic, Maastricht
12.30 Lunch Break	12.30 Lunch Break
13.30 Hepatology M. Abonyi, Budapest	13.30 Infectious Diseases, inflammation I. Brankovic, Maastricht
15.00 Coffee Break	15.00 Coffee Break
15.15 Hepatology M. Abonyi, Budapest	15.15 Assessment

Venue of lectures and seminars

Seminar room 3, 1st floor
Semmelweis Egyetem, Elméleti Tömb
Nagyvárad tér 4.

1089 Budapest

* I. Belklinika Korányi Sándor u. 2/a, Library

Annex2



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Evaluation of EUGIM Module 2 2011/ "Gender Medicine- Additional" for
05.09. -08.09 in Budapest/Semmelweis University

Student form

Educational process

General impression of the Module "Gender Medicine- Additional"

1. I found the objectives of the module clearly defined
 - do not agree
 - agree
 - strongly agree

2. This module was well adapted to my prior knowledge
 - do not agree
 - agree
 - strongly agree

3. The recommended literature was relevant to this module
 - do not agree
 - agree
 - strongly agree

4. This module was well organized

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

5. How much time (in hours) did you spend on preparing for the module before it started?

.....hrs

6. How much time (in hours) did you individually spend during this week on searching, reading, analysing and comprehending the literature?

.....hrs

7. I appreciate the work methods:

Lectures

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

8. The Summer School was well structured

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

9. Grade the structure of the Summer School on a scale from 1-4

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

Course content

10. Grade the instructiveness of the lectures and seminars on a scale from 1- 4:

1 is insufficient, 2 is sufficient, 3 is good, 4 is excellent

Lecturer	Grade the instructiveness of the lecture (scale 1-4)
Prof. M. Kopp	

Dr. A. Fekete	
Prof. F. Túry	
Dr. L. Herszényi	
Prof. M. Hochleitner	
Dr. M. Abonyi	
Prof. Gy. Soós	
Dr. R. Zoller	
Dr. Á. Zana	
Dr. I. Brankovic	

11. The seminar time was sufficient for discussion and repetition

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

12. The use of patient cases was instructive

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

13. The module improved my academic skills

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

14. The module is useful for me in my work as physician / medical specialist

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

15. Not being a medical doctor, the module is useful for me in my work as
(researcher, ..., please fill in your profession)

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

16. The module as a whole was

- too easy
- easy
- good
- intensive
- too heavy

Evaluation of facilities

17. The provision of information was well organized

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

18. The information was well tailored to the module content and its participants

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

Assessment

19. The final assessment was representative for the contents of the module

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

OPEN Questions

Which lectures (max 2) would you rate as most instructive concerning the content of the module? Please explain

Which lectures (max 2) would you rate as least instructive concerning the content of the module? Please explain

Which patient case would you rate as most instructive concerning the content of the module?
Please explain

Which patient case would you rate as least instructive concerning the content of the module?
Please explain

Are there aspects, elements, topics that you missed from the contents of this module?

What would you like to see changed in following editions of the module?

Additional remarks:

Name (optional)

Annex3



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Evaluation of EUGIM Module 2 2011/ "Gender Medicine- Additional" for
05.09. -08.09 in Budapest/Semmelweis University

Teacher form, open questions

Educational process

1. How did you experience the module as a whole?

2. How did you experience your own lecture/seminar?

3. Did you attend lectures of your colleagues?
4. If yes, please illustrate this experience
5. How do you assess the organization of the module?
6. What can be improved in the next edition of the module?

Course content

7. Can you estimate whether the module was tailored to the level of previous knowledge of the participants?
8. Can you estimate whether your lecture was tailored to the level of previous knowledge of the participants?
9. Which suggestions for improvement do you have?

Evaluation of facilities

10. How would you grade the available facilities? What could be improved?

Assessment

11. What is your opinion on the final assessment in terms of content and timeframe?

Additional remarks

Name (optional)