

\*\*\*\*\*  
**Evaluation of the 2011 Summer School on Gender Medicine**  
\*\*\*\*\*

# EUGIM

## European Education Program for Gender Medicine

Evaluation of the 2011 Summer School on Gender Medicine (*in progress, first data and recommendations*)

Sassari, September 19-22, 2011

Ivan Brankovic  
Petra Verdonk  
Ineke Klinge

Maastricht University  
October 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 2<sup>nd</sup> Summer School Gender Medicine, Sassari
  - Development of education material*
  - Structure of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Summer School in Sassari*
  - Communication strategy of the Summer School*
  - Participants*
3. Evaluation
  - Evaluation forms (revised ones)*
  - Student evaluations***
  - Teacher evaluations***
  - Pre-test*
  - Interviews*
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
  - V Pretest Form
  - VI Interview Guide

### 3. Evaluation

*Evaluation forms (revised ones)*

***Student evaluations (quantitative & qualitative)***

***Teacher evaluations***

*Pre-test*

*Interviews*

Student evaluations : OPEN questions (n=31)

**Which lectures (max 2) would you rate as *most* and which lectures (max 2) would you rate as *least* instructive? Please explain.**

**Most instructive lectures:** Miller (8), Schenk-Gustafsson (3), CVD (3), pharmacology (3), Klinge (2), kidney diseases (2), Franconi (2), Hochleitner (2), Regitz-Zagrosek (2), drug abuse (2), diabetes (2), stress response, d'Aquila (2), violence (2), Carrero, communications, media, CVD & epidemiology, regulatory agencies and gender, sex & gender in cardiovascular drug utilization, Lagro-Janssen

**Least instructive lectures:** S. Adam (7) + work stress (3), Carru (4), Manacorda (3), dom. violence (2), communication (Signani), Lagro-Janssen, regulatory agencies

**Which DVD would you rate as *most* instructive and which DVD would you rate as *least* instructive? Please explain.**

**Most instructive DVD:** domestic violence (3), Fattore (3), heart failure (2), pain (2), drug abuse, Lagro-Janssen

**Least instructive DVD:** domestic violence (3), clinical cases, "hard sex scene - take my eyes".

**Which working group would you rate as *most* instructive and which working group would you rate as *least* instructive? Please explain.**

**Most instructive working group:** communication (5), domestic violence (4), drug abuse (2), oncology (2), on IPV, chest pain, discussion on Legato, cardiology, Fattore, clinical cases (Regitz-Zagrosek)

**Least instructive working group:** clinical cases (2), violence, communication

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

- gender and psychology
- relationship between medical [doctors] and patients
- homosexuality
- pregnancy, infection and autoimmune diseases, fundamental genetics, science in sex & gender diff.
- implementation tools in clinical practice
- access to healthcare service
- Autoimmune diseases (2)

- Neurological diseases (Alzheimer) (2)
- Diseases of the thyroid (2)
- more lectures on basic research and preclinical studies
- medicine (drugs) (2)
- pharmacist-patient relationship
- economical data (2)
- more about the roles of men and women in the society (masculinity/ femininity)
- differences in [help]seeking behaviour

**Do you have recommendations to improve the Gender Medicine Summer School or other additional remarks?**

- more men need to be involved in this field
- needs to be more structured; program should be sent in advance, not in the last minute; level of presentations to be raised (English and presenting skills); better organization (the room on the first day was not prepared, the sound was not checked in advance, nor the computers); lecturers shouldn't just read their presentations from slides; but: the food was good; it should be organized next time in a more lively city, or a cultural program should be prepared
- we need a 3<sup>rd</sup> summer school, 2012
- more clear information
- define the school target group
- more introductory lectures
- please upload all the presentations
- write the sources (data and affirmations) in presentations better
- more clarification on which (if not all\_) lectures are necessary to obtain certification; the schedule was a bit full, too long day

Teacher forms, open question (N=7)

**How did you experience the summer school overall? (e.g. content, pedagogical climate..)**

- 1: I have learnt a lot from lectures, and I really enjoy the friendly and professional climate.
- 2: I had a good overall experience in this summer school, both in terms of content and in terms of the pedagogical climate.
- 3: Very good.
- 4: Very good. Very interested students, good discussions, mostly very good lectures. Student presentations underrepresented.
- 5: A high level experience.
- 6: It was good overall. I would suggest less topics to be covered, but at the same time going more into details.
- 7: Fine, reduced topics → very good, working groups good connection with the talks

**How do you assess the organization of the summer school? (information, structuring, facilities...)**

- 1: Everything was perfect! Available staff, very nice organization.
- 2: The organization was very good, even though I am not in the best position to give an opinion on this point, since the summer school was held in the city where I currently live and work.
- 3: Very good.
- 4: Very good. Not everything available on the homepage. There should be CME questions to students to assess progress.
- 5: Really welcoming.
- 6: I felt good about the overall organization of the event.
- 7: okey

**How do you assess the academic level of the course in relation to participants' academic level?**

- 1: All lectures gave very important up-to-date information on their specific field, for me the academic level was extremely high.
- 2: The level of the course was in general good, with some outstanding contributions.
- 3: Course level was ok, but the content of the lectures did not always fit well into the interests of the participants.
- 4: adequate – very good match.
- 5: I assess on high level of treatment
- 6: There was a good balance of different levels both at participant level as well as subject depth.
- 7: I do not know the participants' academic level

**How did you experience your own lecture? Please reflect on for instance content, interaction with class, understanding of participants.**

- 1: I felt completely comfortable, audience was curious and interactive, discussion went beyond the lecture, and I feel really happy about this experience.

2: On the basis of the feedback I had from the participants, I felt the main messages I wanted to convey with my lecture have been understood by the majority of the participants.

3: Content/ interaction lecture: very good.

Content/ interaction two workshops: excellent.

4: Skipped one part for the sake of time and not to overload the students. Very good discipline, understanding seemed ok.

5: I caught the understanding of colleagues of the same discipline (psychology).

6: Felt pretty good. Could have used more real life examples. There was a good understanding of participants on the lecture.

7: My talk was Ok as far as I know. The working group was inspiring, very good discussion

**Did you attend lectures of other colleagues? If no, why not? If yes, please reflect on your experiences.**

1: Yes, I only missed some due to personal problems, but I will check their presentation when it becomes available on the site.

2: I attended several (but not all) lectures, and in spite of the different scientific background, I had a very good impression about their teaching ability.

3: Substandard lectures from: Silvia, Italian professor and his female colleague, awful presentation. Good standard but too long (and too specialized! Too difficult): Virginia and Juan Jesus Carrero.

4: I knew most lectures from before (so did not attend all). Introduction was new and very good.

5: Yes, they presented reasoned and full of data lectures.

6: Yes, I attended. The other lectures were interesting - and there were multiple connection points between different lectures.

7: Some lectures seemed to be the same as last year, so I did not attend all lectures. The rest was OK but again I do not know the background of the participants

**Do you have recommendations to improve the Gender Medicine Summer School or other additional remarks?**

1: Only to ensure such an experience on a regular basis.

2: No comments.

3: Lectures not longer than 30 min followed by 15 min discussion. Better performances of teachers.

4: Meeting rooms should facilitate discussion among students and chairs. Students structured input (posters) or three min. statements should be included.

5: /

6: More real-life examples should be used throughout the whole event.

7: a) I would focus on one simple topic, like neuroscience, CVD, Infectious diseases etc. Change the topic each year

b) Define the academic level of the group in advance



Education and Culture DG

# Lifelong Learning Programme

Evaluation of EUGiM Summer School Sassari 2011

Student form (n=31)

## General impression

### **1. I found the objectives of the module clearly defined [n = 30]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 16%
- agree: 58%
- strongly agree: 23%

### **2. This module was well adapted to my prior knowledge [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 3%
- disagree: 10%
- agree nor disagree: 16%
- agree: 52%
- strongly agree: 19%

### **3. The recommended literature was relevant to this module [n = 30]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 3%
- agree nor disagree: 23%
- agree: 55%
- strongly agree: 16%

### **4. This module was well organized [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 3%
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree 13%
- agree: 55%
- strongly agree: 29%

### **5. On the whole, the Summer School was: [n = 28]**

- too easy: 3%

- easy: 26%
- not easy not difficult: 48%
- difficult: 13%
- too difficult: 0

### **Hours spent on the summer school**

#### **6. How much time (hrs) did you spend on preparing for the Summer school before it started? [n = 28]**

- mean: around 5h
- approx. 30% of the attendants = 2h

#### **7. How much time (hrs) did you individually spend during this week on searching, reading, analyzing and comprehending the literature? [n = 29]**

- mean: around 4,5h
- approx. 50% of the attendants have been preparing for max. 3h per day
- approx. 78% of the attendants wrote 5h or less

### **Evaluation of facilities**

#### **8. The provision of information was well organized [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 10%
- agree nor disagree: 26%
- agree: 55%
- strongly agree: 9%

#### **9. the information was well tailored to the Summer school content and its participants [n = 30]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 26%
- agree: 65%
- strongly agree: 7%

#### **10. ICT/ library facilities were good [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 10%
- disagree: 10%
- agree nor disagree: 41%
- agree: 32%
- strongly agree: 6%

#### **11. The final assessment was representative for the contents of the Summer school [n = 29]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 3%
- agree nor disagree: 26%

- agree: 48%
- strongly agree: 16%

### **Course content**

#### **12. The lectures were instructive [n = 30]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 6%
- agree: 52%
- strongly agree: 39%

#### **13. The working groups were instructive [n = 29]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 3%
- agree nor disagree: 29%
- agree: 36%
- strongly agree: 26%

#### **14. The Summer school was well structured [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 3,2%
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 23%
- agree: 45%
- strongly agree: 29%

#### **15. The Summer school had a strong coherence [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 3%
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 29%
- agree: 55%
- strongly agree: 13%

#### **16. The Summer school improved my academic skills [n = 31]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 3%
- agree nor disagree: 23%
- agree: 58%
- strongly agree: 16%

#### **17. I appreciate the work methods [n = 29]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 3%
- agree nor disagree: 26%
- agree: 55%
- strongly agree: 10%

#### **18. The DVD material added to my understanding of the lecture content [n = 26]**

- strongly disagree: 10%
- disagree: 10%

- agree nor disagree: 26%
- agree: 23%
- strongly agree: 16%

**19. The Summer school is useful for me in my work as physician/ medical specialist [n = 26]**

- strongly disagree: 0
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 19%
- agree: 52%
- strongly agree: 13%

**20. Not being a medical doctor, the Summer school is useful for me in my work as... (e.g. researcher) [n = 20]**

- strongly disagree: 3%
- disagree: 0
- agree nor disagree: 10%
- agree: 39%
- strongly agree: 13%

**Grading the Summer school**

**21. Grade the instructiveness of the lectures [n = 30]**

- not sufficient: 0
- sufficient: 10%
- good: 74%
- excellent: 13%

**22. Grade the instructiveness of the patient cases [n = 27]**

- not sufficient: 3%
- sufficient: 32%
- good: 39%
- excellent: 13%

**23. Grade the value of the DVD material [n = 28]**

- not sufficient: 13%
- sufficient: 36%
- good: 32%
- excellent: 10%

**24. Grade the structure of the Summer school [n = 31]**

- not sufficient: 3%
- sufficient: 13%
- good: 68%
- excellent: 16%

**25. Grade the coherence of the Summer school [n = 31]**

- not sufficient: 0
- sufficient: 10%
- good: 65%

- excellent: 26%

**26. Grade the overall quality of teaching/ performance of the teachers in this module [n = 31]**

- not sufficient: 3%

- sufficient: 7%

- good: 71%

- excellent: 19%