
Evaluation of the 2010 Summer School on Gender Medicine

EUGIM

European Education Program for Gender Medicine

I. Klinge, I. Brankovic, P. Verdonk

Maastricht University
April, 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.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. EUGiM Summer School Gender Medicine
 - Development of education material*
 - Structure of the first Summer School in Berlin*
 - Communication strategy of the Summer School*
 - Participants*
3. Evaluation
 - Evaluation forms*
 - Student evaluations*
 - Teacher evaluations*
4. Conclusions and recommendations
5. References
6. Annexes
 - I Programme Summer School
 - II Student evaluation Form
 - III Teacher evaluation Form
 - IV Results closed questions Student Forms

1. Introduction

In this report, we describe the evaluation of EUGiM Summer School Gender Medicine. We start with a short introduction and the aims of the summer school. Next, we elaborate on the organization and participants of the first pilot in Berlin. Results of the evaluation of the summer school are presented in chapter 3. We finish with implications for the next pilot and the implementation of the education material in other academic settings.

Time has come to make sex- and gender-sensitive approaches a routine in all aspects of biomedical research and practice, as well as in academic settings. A substantial amount of scientific literature reflects the importance of sex and gender aspects within medicine. Also, a limited number of textbooks covering the field are available as well (Klinge & Wiesemann, 2010; Legato, 2004; Rieder & Lohff, 2008; Hochleitner, 2008; Regitz-Zagrosek & Fuchs, 2006; Hurrelmann & Kolip, 2002; Lagro-Janssen, 1997). Currently however, these books are not yet used for the purpose of developing medical and biomedical curricula that thoroughly incorporate sex and gender aspects. Aside from a few universities, there has hardly been any reform in medical education in Europe. Also, a great deal of imbalance in gender knowledge throughout the European continent can be observed. A thorough systematic compilation of sex and gender aspects awaits to be produced.

Partners from several European universities – Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin-Charité, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Medizinische Universität Innsbruck, Maastricht University, Universitas Budapestinensis de Semmelweis nominata, 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)”. The Summer School provides education on sex and gender differences in cases of widespread diseases, therapeutic approaches and research. Furthermore, the project is expected to attract experts in gender medicine and form a European network, with the purpose of further sensitizing medical schools, medical organizations, health care politics, and insurance companies among others.

Sex-and-gender- sensitivity will yield evidence for a more comprehensive scientific perspective and decision making in health care. It contributes to the reduction of existing sex and gender disparities in health care, helps policy makers to improve their health policies and arm students and professionals with a greater knowledge and capacity to improve the quality of health care (Correa-de-Araujo, 2006).

In September 2010, the first Summer School Gender Medicine was piloted in Berlin. This report reflects the evaluation of that first pilot. In accordance with the Quality Assurance System developed for the EUGiM project we aimed to

- evaluate the educational process including teaching staff performance
- evaluate the course content by student evaluations
- evaluate the organization of the course including the facilities

2. EUGiM Summer School Gender Medicine

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. Two consecutive Summer Schools are planned, with the intention of piloting the material and further improvement through a system of quality assurance.

Development of education material

The EUGiM work packages (P1 – P6) have been divided among the partner universities. 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 cardiology, pulmonology, renal and infectious diseases, immunology, oncology, epidemiology pharmacology, drug addiction, psychosocial aspects, prevention and health care. The scientific content for every discipline/research area to be taught was defined and created on the basis of a systematic literature research. Learning goals, learning materials and lecture slides as well as exam questions were developed. Materials developed earlier at Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre in the Netherlands (clinical patient cases and DVDs illustrating doctor- patient encounters) were subtitled into English. The main body of the learning materials consisted of reports, 20-30 pages in length, along with 10-20 exam questions per field. The abstracts of the lectures as well as 5 introductory slides illustrating the topic are made available from the project website for participants from August 2010 onwards.

Structure of the first Summer School in Berlin

The first Summer School took place in Berlin, in September 2010. The e-learning materials were placed in a blackboard environment before the Summer School had started. For the programme (Monday-Friday) see Annex I

The following lectures were given: Keynote Lecture by Londa Schiebinger; Gender in Public Health – Focus on Prevention, Epidemiology, Cardiovascular Diseases I & II, Renal Disease, Oncology and Hematology, Gender in Mental Health, Immunology & Rheumatology, Genes and Hormones, Epigenetic Control of Sex-Specific Gene Expression, Pharmacology, Endocrinology and Metabolism – Diabetes, Sex/Gender in Addictive Behaviour, Domestic Violence, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Neuropsychiatric Diseases and Pain, Infectious Diseases and Inflammation, Pulmonary Diseases, and Gender Mainstreaming at Universities. In order to illustrate the clinical relevance and enhance learning through variation in teaching methods, in several lectures (cardiovascular diseases, immunology & rheumatology, domestic violence and addictive behaviour) clinical patient cases, DVDs with physician-patient encounters or both were presented. Time was assigned to discuss the patient cases and the DVDs. In the lecture on Infectious Diseases and Inflammation a ‘stakeholder meeting’ was incorporated, in which participants had to discuss the topic *Human papillomavirus* vaccination from the perspectives of parents, public health professionals, policymakers, and researchers.

A poster session in which participants could present their research was organized on Day 4. Abstracts for the poster session were assessed for their quality and content in advance. The Summer School ended on Friday with a multiple choice test/exam.

Communication strategy of the Summer School

The task of communicating the activities was performed by the team at the Institute of Gender in Medicine (GiM) at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin-Charité, Berlin. The first message with general information regarding the summer school pilot – date, topic and venue – was announced in March 2010. Flyers and invitation letters were disseminated via e-mail and partner institutions were asked to announce it on their websites. Furthermore, the GiM website presented the information about the first summer school, and from the end of March 2010 so did the EUGiM project website. The international e-mail list comprised approximately 2.500 e-mail addresses.

In April, international invitation letters were distributed by mail together with the second announcement, which included the full programme (an overview of lectures, lecturers and time schedule) and flyers for manual distribution. In this way, special target groups were contacted. In addition, this second announcement ("reminder") was sent by email in May 2010. The third and last email announcement followed in July 2010.

The event was further announced in April in the online calendar of Association of the Scientific Medical Societies in Germany. GiM office also ran the advertisement in the journal of the Ärztekammer Berlin (Medical Association Berlin) and announced the credit points for German physicians in the May issue. Finally an advertisement was placed in the journal of the Kassenärztliche Vereinigung (Association of Statutory Health Insurance German Physicians) in the May issue to reach also physicians in private practice.

The groups that were targeted were:

- Societies that are interested in gender medicine
- Societies of the disciplines that were taught at the summer school
- Industry in the medical field
- Health insurance companies (German)
- Ministries (mainly German)
- Politicians (Berlin)
- Deans of Medical Faculties (Austrian, German, Swiss)
- Gender Institutes
- Gender Equality Officers (Berlin)
- Media via own email distribution list
- Media via press releases by the Charité press spokeswoman, press spokeswoman of the German Heart Institute Berlin (DHZB) and the GiM press spokeswoman (Contentic Media services gmbh)
- General Students' Committee (Charité)
- Former participants of annual GiM symposia and the 4th International Congress of Gender Medicine of the International Society of Gender Medicine (IGM) in 2009
- Members of the German Society of Gender Medicine (DGesGM) and of the International Society of Gender Medicine (IGM)

- Scientists

Participants

The summer school was attended by participants of various academic degrees and professional backgrounds. Here, the information as provided for 44 participants is presented.

Academic degree

The participants provided the following data about their educational backgrounds: MD (8); Dr, MPH (3); PhD-student (3); PhD (2); OÄ Dr. Med (2); Priv. Doz. Dr. Med (2); Magister (2); PharmD (1); Dr. med. Vet. (1); MA (1); Senior Psychologist (1); Master in Women's and Gender Studies (1); Political Sciences and Health Psychologist (1); and no entry (16).

Background and experience in the field of sex/gender

Background in sex/gender studies and/or research (12); some experience (3); none (10); unclear answers (3); and no entry (16). Out of the 12 participants with a background in sex/gender, the majority were from the field of cardiovascular and/or coronary diseases, followed by pharmacology; two persons came from epidemiology and one had background in CVD guidelines.

3. Evaluation of the Summer School

Main purpose of the evaluation was to assess the quality of the summer school according to 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 (fully disagree=1 to fully agree =5) as well as open questions.

Students were asked to fill in 26 questions about educational process, course content, facilities and the final exam. Open questions went into details about 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 44 students attending the summer school, 21 forms were returned. Twenty students answered to most items. Eight teacher forms were returned, 4 of these anonymous. Therefore, not all students nor teachers provided their input to the evaluation.

Student evaluations

The data from the multiple-choice section is given in the appendix IV. 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 Summer School. The following lectures were reported: Cardiovascular Diseases (8 times); Infectious Diseases and Inflammation (5 times); Keynote Lecture (3 times); Oncology and Hematology (3 times); Endocrinology and Metabolism (3 times); Pharmacology (3 times); Epidemiology (2 times); Gender in Public Health - Focus on Prevention (2 times); CVD 2nd lecture (2 times); CVD 1st lecture (1 times); Epigenetic Control of Sex-Specific Gene Expression (1 times); Immunology and Rheumatology (1 times); Genes and Hormones (1 times); and Sex/Gender in Addictive behaviour (1 times).

Second question was which lectures (max 2) the student would rate as **least instructive** concerning the content of the Summer School. The results were as follows: Epigenetic Control of Sex-Specific Gene Expression (9 times); Gender in Mental Health (6 times); Gender in Public Health - Focus on Prevention (4 times); Genes and Hormones (3 times); and Sex/ Gender in Addictive behaviour (2 times).

For the question which **clinical patient case** would be rated as **most instructive** the results were: Immunology and Rheumatology (reported 5 times); Domestic Violence (3 times); Cardiovascular Diseases (1 time); and Sex/Gender in Addictive Behaviour (1 time). The question on which **clinical patient case** the student would rate as **least instructive**, the answers were: Sex/Gender in Addictive Behaviour (3 times); Immunology and Rheumatology (1 time); and Domestic Violence (1 time).

Most instructive DVDs were considered: Immunology and Rheumatology (5 times); Domestic Violence (3 times); and Cardiovascular Diseases (2 times).

Least instructive DVDs were considered: Sex/Gender in Addictive Behaviour (2 times); and Immunology and Rheumatology (2 times).

* Note correspondence between most instructive clinical patient case and DVD (same topics were valued) Question: were the paper patient case on violence, addiction and CVD actually incorporated / read or was just the DVD shown??

The Thursday Poster Session was described as: ‘interesting’ (5 participants), ‘very good’ (1 participant), ‘good’ (3 participants), ‘informative’ (1 participant), ‘excellent formats’ (1 participant), ‘useful’ (2 participants); ‘too short’ (1 participant); and ‘should be organized throughout the week – everyone was too tired at the end of the week’ (3 participants).

Aspects and elements that were mentioned as **missing** from the contents of this Summer School were the following: ‘Should have a more structured overview’, ‘There were too many topics’.

The topics that were **lacking** in the opinion of attendants were: surgical topics (2 participants); psychology (2 participants) and neurological disorders; therapeutic aspects; different treatments of males and females; brain development; gender aspects of motivation for changing lifestyle; clinical epidemiology; basic research topics; cultural aspects of sex and gender; bones; vaccination; sports medicine; and sex differentiation mechanisms (hormone effects, sex chromosomes, epigenetic programming, environmental effects).

Participants were also asked what they would like to see **changed** in following editions of the Summer School. The answers were (in summarized formulations): It should have shorter lectures, less lectures and less topics (4 participants); More group work (3 participants); lectures should take less time per day (2 participants); More patient cases (1); More focus on theories not commonly used in medical research (1); More on useful statistical analyses; and More on funding possibilities (1).

On the question “Would you prefer to include group work into the Summer School?”, 9 participants responded with ‘Yes’, 4 with ‘No’.

Additional remarks from the students:

- Very well organized (4 participants)
- Really interesting (2 participants)
- It is important to give more facts for instance on diagnosis, therapy, prevention (2 participants)
- It was an extraordinary school from the aspect of content, organization and teaching methodology
- Great
- Good setting
- Lectures given by specialists were the best
- I’m disappointed by the turnout of the male participants (proposed solution: invite more male teachers?)
- Should be more structured

- Lecture goals should be clearer from the beginning in order to be able to focus on the appropriate knowledge
- I enjoyed the stakeholder's meeting/workshop on HPV vaccination a lot.

Teacher evaluations

This section describes the data from the teacher forms. As regards the education process, the **summer school as a whole** was experienced positively by the teachers. The teachers mentioned the following aspects: good knowledge exchange, very good experience, very positive, good start for the project, fairly satisfactory experience, positive, very well organized; friendly atmosphere.

As regards their **own lectures**, teachers mentioned the following: tried to combine effective education methods with state-of-the art, good atmosphere; interesting questions, felt good, well attended and perceived, active questions also after lecture, "nobody seemed to sleep, so...", more focused on pedagogical potentials as thought on the beforehand, difficult to identify target group, active discussion, interested crowd.

Not all teachers attended all **lectures of their colleagues**. However, those who were present at other lectures, were asked to evaluate them. The teachers found the lectures:

- informative, opportunity to learn from others interesting, good lectures
- in general enlightening, some too specific and detailed (epigenetics); CVD overrepresented, some degree of overlap and repetition
- level extremely different, level of target group not defined
- quite satisfactory ones (P. Verdonk, K. Schenck-Gustafsson); some too detailed but well delivered; some quite hard to follow (too specific as if for conferences)
- some very positive, difficult to assess target group

The teachers assessed the **organization** of the Summer School as follows: Excellent, very good, excellent, thanks to Vera, (very) well-organized; synchrony between lectures needs attention, poor instruction prior to lectures.

On the question what can be **improved** in the next edition of the Summer School, the teachers gave the following answers: Nothing (zero), lectures on psychology and roles of men and women in society, focus on target group, hotel with wireless overall & structure of lectures, more practical exercise & better definition of target group & clearer definition of teaching goals, nothing.

The evaluation of whether **the summer school in general and their lecture in particular was tailored to the level of previous knowledge** of the participants appeared to be rather difficult. The teachers gave the following answers to the synchrony between the level of the summer school and of the students: difficult to say, because participants came from different fields of research / I think some non-medical participants may have felt lost in some very specific topics / no idea of level of participants / not possible to generalize / very different levels of knowledge / difficult to assess / no.

Whether their own lecture was tailored to the previous knowledge of participants was answered as follows: participants had basic level of my topic; opportunity to deepen / hope so / Hope so; gave examples accessible for different disciplines. Received comments afterwards of well perception / no idea of level of participants / in my very humble opinion: yes / not really / no.

Suggestions for **improvement** were: less lectures per days; instead series of free workshops for special needs of participants / more time / focus and discuss target group / make lectures more pedagogical, more focus on take-home messages / rehearsal and integration of former experience.

The **facilities** were positively evaluated: Good, excellent, OK, Internet! Food quite good, good.

As regards the **final assessment**, the teachers commented that it was: OK, a bit disconnected, more a symposium workshop than a course; more coordination and pedagogy needed, OK, max three day course. From the answers, we conclude that respondents seemed to interpret this question as concerning the *course* where it was meant to concern the Final Assessment/Exam.

Additional remarks from the teachers were that: the Faculty was participating to much in Q&A; sometimes to much challenging the lecture, undermining lecturers confidence; also if faculty dominates the Q&A participants may feel shy to ask.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

As regards the content, the students would like to learn about gender theory as a general introduction. The structure of the course can be made more coherent and generally, less: shorter lectures, fewer lectures, and fewer topics. However, they also gave a long list of new topics they would be interested in. This suggests that the course in Gender Medicine has made the students aware that sex/gender issues play a role in very many biological and medical topics, from surgery to gender aspects of motivation for healthy lifestyle. Furthermore, the students were aware of a minimal participation of male students and teachers. The teachers' evaluations are in line with the student evaluations. They also mention the need for tuning of lectures and topics, and they also refer to psychology and gender roles in society as topics that are missing. Furthermore, the teachers report that tailoring to the needs of the target group is important, and more pedagogy in teaching is required such as take home messages in each lecture, variation in teaching methods, interactive lectures, or practical exercises.

The issues mentioned by the teachers and the students will be addressed for the second summer school in Sassari in September 2011. After discussion in the steering committee, in particular harmonizing the lectures, an introductory lecture on gender theories in health, workshops for special needs and attention for educational methods will be focal points for the second pilot.

5. References

- Hochleitner M: Gender Medicine. Ringvorlesung an der Medizinischen Universität Innsbruck. Wien: Facultas; 2008.
- Hurrelmann K & Kolip P: Geschlecht, Gesundheit und Krankheit. Männer und Frauen im Vergleich. Bern: Huber; 2002.
- Klinge I & Wiesemann C (eds). Sex and Gender In Biomedicine. Theories, Methodologies, Results. Universitätsverlag Göttingen 2010. ISBN 978-3-941875-26-5
- Lagro-Janssen T & Noordenbos G: Sekseverschillen in ziekte en gezondheid. Nijmegen: SUN; 1997.
- Legato MJ: Principles of Gender-Specific Medicine. San Diego, California: Elsevier Academic press; 2004.
- Regitz-Zagrosek V & Fuchs J: Geschlechterforschung in der Medizin. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang; 2006.
- Rieder A & Lohff B: Gender Medizin. Geschlechtsspezifische Aspekte für die klinische Praxis. Wien: Springer; 2008.

Annex I

EUGIM Summer School 2010, Sep. 20-24

Programme

Monday, September 20

Welcome Address

Keynote Lecture

Gendered Innovations in Science, Medicine,
and Engineering

L. Schiebinger, Stanford

Coffee Break

Gender in Public Health, Focus on Prevention

M. Hochleitner, Innsbruck

Lunch Break

Epidemiology

B. Babitsch, Berlin

Coffee Break

Cardiovascular Diseases I

V. Regitz-Zagrosek, Berlin

Clinical Cases from the Database

T. Lagro-Janssen, Nijmegen

Renal Disease

J. Carrero, Stockholm

Tuesday, September 21

Oncology and Hematology

M. Hochleitner, Innsbruck

Gender in Mental Health

S. Adam, Budapest

Coffee Break

Immunology, Rheumatology

I. Brankovic & I. Klinge, Maastricht

Clinical Cases from the Database

T. Lagro-Janssen, Nijmegen

Lunch Break

Genes and Hormones

S. Mahmoodzadeh, Berlin

Epigenetic Control of Sex-Specific Gene
Expression

J. Xu, North Grafton

Coffee Break

Pharmacology

F. Franconi, Sassari

Wednesday, September 22

Endocrinology and Metabolism I - Diabetes

A. Kautzky-Willer, Vienna

Coffee Break

Sex/Gender in Addictive Behaviour

F. Franconi, Sassari

Domestic Violence

K. Schenck-Gustafsson, Stockholm

Clinical Cases from the Database

T. Lagro-Janssen, Nijmegen

Lunch Break

Gastroenterology and Hepatology

S. Oertelt-Prigione, Berlin

Coffee Break

Neuropsychiatric Diseases and Pain

K. Schenck-Gustafsson, Stockholm

Thursday, September 23

Cardiovascular Diseases II

V. Regitz-Zagrosek, Berlin

Clinical Cases from the Database

T. Lagro-Janssen, Nijmegen

Coffee Break

Infectious Diseases, Inflammation

P. Verdonk & I. Klinge, Maastricht

Lunch Break

Pulmonary Diseases

C. Grohé, Berlin

Coffee Break

Round Table Discussion

- Definition of Gender Medicine

Posters, Wine and Cheese

Final Dinner

Friday, September 24

Gender Mainstreaming at Universities

C. Kurmeyer, Berlin

Coffee Break

Multiple Choice Test/Exam on all lectures!

Lunch Break

Adjourn



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Evaluation of EUGiM Summer School 2010

Annex II - Student form

Educational process

General impression of the Summer School module

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. Grade the overall quality of teaching / performance of the teachers in this module on a scale from 1 -4 (1 is insufficient, 2 is sufficient, 3 is good, 4 is excellent)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

6. How much time (in hours) did you spend on preparing for the Summer School before it started?

.....hrs

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

.....hrs

8. I appreciate the work methods

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

Course content

9. The lectures were instructive

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

11. The use of patient cases was instructive

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

12. Grade the instructiveness of the patient cases on a scale from 1-4

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4

13. The DVD material added to my understanding of the lecture content

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

14. Grade the value of the DVD material on a scale from 1-4

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

15. The Summer School was well structured

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

17. The Summer School had a strong coherence

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

18. Grade the coherence of the Summer School on a scale from 1-4

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

19. The Summer School improved my academic skills

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

20. The Summer School is useful for me in my work as physician / medical specialist

- do not agree
- agree

- strongly agree

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

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

22. The Summer School as a whole was

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

Evaluation of facilities

23. The provision of information was well organized

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

24. The information was well tailored to the Summer School content and its participants

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

25. ICT / library facilities were good

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

Assessment

26. The final assessment was representative for the contents of the Summer School

- do not agree
- agree
- strongly agree

OPEN Questions

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

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

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

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

Which DVD would you rate as most instructive concerning the content of the Summer School? Please explain

Which DVD would you rate as least instructive concerning the content of the Summer School? Please explain

Project Number: 502432-LLP-1-DE-ERASMUS-ECDEM



How did you value the Poster Session?

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

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

Would you prefer to include group work into the Summer School?

Additional remarks:

Name (optional)

5. How do you assess the organization of the Summer School?

6. What can be improved in the next edition of the Summer School?

Course content

7. Can you estimate whether the Summer School 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)



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Annex IV - Evaluation of EUGiM Summer School 2010

Student form (n=20)

Educational process

General impression of the Summer School module

1. I found the objectives of the module clearly defined $M = 2,37$
 - do not agree (1) 5%
 - agree (2) 50%
 - strongly agree (3) 40%

2. This module was well adapted to my prior knowledge $M = 2,20$
 - do not agree (1) 20%
 - agree (2) 40%
 - strongly agree (3) 40%

3. The recommended literature was relevant to this module $M = 2,22$
 - do not agree (1) 10%
 - agree (2) 50%
 - strongly agree (3) 30%

4. This module was well organized $M = 2,50$
 - do not agree (1) 15%
 - agree (2) 20%
 - strongly agree (3) 65%

5. Grade the overall quality of teaching / performance of the teachers in this module on a scale from 1 -4 (1 is insufficient, 2 is sufficient, 3 is good, 4 is excellent) **M = 3,20**

- 1 (0%)
- 2 (5%)
- 3 (70%)
- 4 (20%)

6. How much time (in hours) did you spend on preparing for the Summer School before it started? **(will calculate later on)**

.....hrs

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

.....hrs

8. I appreciate the work methods **M = 2,28**

- do not agree (10%)
- agree (45%)
- strongly agree (40%)

Course content

9. The lectures were instructive **M = 2,55**

- do not agree (0%)
- agree (45%)
- strongly agree (55%)

10. Grade the instructiveness of the lectures on a scale from 1- 4 **M = 3,10**

- 1 (0%)
- 2 (15%)
- 3 (60%)
- 4 (25%)

11. The use of patient cases was instructive **M = 2,48**

- do not agree (5%)
- agree (40%)
- strongly agree (50%)

12. Grade the instructiveness of the patient cases on a scale from 1-4 **M = 3,45**

- 1 (0%)
- 2 (10%)
- 3 (35%)

- 4 (55%)
13. The DVD material added to my understanding of the lecture content **M = 2,42**
- do not agree (0%)
 - agree (55%)
 - strongly agree (40%)
14. Grade the value of the DVD material on a scale from 1-4 **M = 3,56**
- 1 (0%)
 - 2 (0%)
 - 3 (40%)
 - 4 (50%)
15. The Summer School was well structured **M = 2,26**
- do not agree (15%)
 - agree (40%)
 - strongly agree (40%)
16. Grade the structure of the Summer School on a scale from 1-4 **M = 3,05**
- 1 (0%)
 - 2 (25%)
 - 3 (45%)
 - 4 (30%)
17. The Summer School had a strong coherence **M = 1,90**
- do not agree (25%)
 - agree (60%)
 - strongly agree (15%)
18. Grade the coherence of the Summer School on a scale from 1-4 **M = 2,75**
- 1 (15%)
 - 2 (15%)
 - 3 (50%)
 - 4 (20%)
19. The Summer School improved my academic skills **M = 2,30**
- do not agree (0%)
 - agree (70%)
 - strongly agree (30%)
20. The Summer School is useful for me in my work as physician / medical specialist **M = 2,25**
- do not agree (5%)
 - agree (50%)

- strongly agree (25%)

21. Not being a medical doctor, the Summer School is useful for me in my work as
(researcher, ..., please fill in your profession) **M = 2,18**

- do not agree (5%)
- agree (35%)
- strongly agree (15%)

22. The Summer School as a whole was **M = 3,53**

- too easy (0%)
- easy (10%)
- good (30%)
- intensive (55%)
- too heavy (5%)

Evaluation of facilities

23. The provision of information was well organized **M = 2,32**

- do not agree (5%)
- agree (55%)
- strongly agree (35%)

24. The information was well tailored to the Summer School content and its participants
M=2,40

- do not agree (5%)
- agree (50%)
- strongly agree (45%)

25. ICT / library facilities were good **M=1,85**

- do not agree (15%)
- agree (45%)
- strongly agree (5%)

Assessment

26. The final assessment was representative for the contents of the Summer School **M = 2,25**

- do not agree (5%)
- agree (50%)
- strongly agree (25%)

OPEN Questions

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

- CVD (8)
- Inf. Diseases & Inflammation (5)
- Keynote lecture by L. Shiebinger (3)
- Oncology (3)
- Endocrinology (3)
- Pharmacology (3)
- Epidemiology (2)
- Public Health & Prevention (2)
- CVD 2nd lecture (2)
- CVD 1st lecture (1)
- Epigenetics (1)
- Immunology & Rheumatology (1)
- Genes & Hormones (1)
- Addictive behaviour (1)

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

- Epigenetics (9)
- Gender & Mental Health (6)
- Public Health & Prevention (4)
- Genes & Hormones (3)
- Addictive behaviour (2)

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

- Rheumatoid arthritis/ pain (5)
- Domestic violence (3)
- CVD (1)
- Alcoholism (1)

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

- Alcoholism (3)
- Rheumatoid arthritis/ pain (1)
- Domestic violence (1)

Which **DVD** would you rate as **most instructive** concerning the content of the Summer School? Please explain

- Rheumatoid arthritis/pain (5)
- Domestic violence (3)
- CVD (2)

Which **DVD** would you rate as **least instructive** concerning the content of the Summer School? Please explain

- Alcoholism (2)
- Pain (2)

How did you value the **Poster Session**?

- interesting (5), very good, good (3), informative, excellent formats, useful (2)
- too short
- should be organized throughout the week – everyone was too tired at the end of the week (3)

Are there **aspects, elements, topics that you missed** from the contents of this Summer School?

- Should have a more structured overview
- There were too many topics

Needs more:

- surgical topics (2)
- psychology (2) and neurological disorders
- therapeutic aspects
- different treatments of males and females
- brain development
- gender aspects of motivation for changing lifestyle
- clinical epidemiology
- basic research topics
- cultural aspects of sex and gender
- bones
- vaccination
- sports medicine
- sex differentiation mechanisms (hormone effects, sex chromosomes, epigenetic programming, environmental effects)

What would you like to see **changed** in following editions of the Summer School?

- It should have shorter lectures, less lectures and less topics (4)
- More group work (3)
- lectures should take less time per day (2)
- More cases
- More focus on theories not commonly used in medical research
- More on useful statistical analyses
- More on funding possibilities

Would you prefer to include **group work** into the Summer School?

- Yes (9)
- No (4)

Additional remarks:

- Very well organized (4)
- Really interesting (2)
- It was an extraordinary school from the aspect of content, organization and teaching methodology
- Great
- Good setting
- Lectures given by specialists were the best

- It is important to give more facts on diagnosis, therapy, prevention, etc (2)
- I'm disappointed by the turnout of the male participants (proposed solution: invite more male teachers?)
- Should be more structured
- Lecture goals should be more clear from the beginning in order to be able to focus on the appropriate knowledge
- I enjoyed the workshop on HPV vaccination a lot

Name (optional)