An instrument to evaluate a lecture

K.G.Somasiri , S.Gunawardena, W.A.A.Wijayasiri and Nelun de Silva
Faculty of Medicine, University of Ruhuna, Galle

Abstract

Lectures and tutorials are commonly used to impart knowledge in Sri Lankan Universities. Evaluation of quality of teaching is one aspect of a quality assurance programme. The objective of the study was to develop an instrument with a common scoring system to assess the quality of lectures.

Items for the questionnaire were identified by studying the questionnaires that were used in the Faculty of Medicine, Galle and by giving a questionnaire to students. Focus group discussions were conducted to select items. Content validation of the developed instrument was done in a quality assurance meeting. Data analysis was done to obtain scores under six domains using SPSS. The instrument was validated by administering the questionnaire to students by three lecturers where one lecturer administered it on two lectures.

The scores obtained for each domain were different within lecturer and between lectures when it was administered to students. The developed instrument can be used to evaluate the quality of a lecture under different facets.

Introduction

A change in the behavior is the goal of learning and teaching. There are three components in learning; knowledge, skills and attitudes. Lectures and tutorials are commonly used to impart knowledge in Sri Lankan universities. Skills are imparted in practical classes. The aspect of attitudes is poorly addressed in the university system. The quality of teaching is an important aspect of Teaching-learning experience. Quality of a study programme depends on number of factors. The quality of teaching is one of them.

Evaluation of quality of teaching is one aspect of quality assurance programmes (UGC Publication 2002) Obtaining student feedback using questionnaires is a common practice in the Faculty of Medicine, University of Ruhuna. Though there are common features, the questionnaires that are being used differ from department
to department.

Methodology

Identifying items for the instrument

The questionnaires used in different departments of the faculty were studied to identify suitable items for the proposed questionnaire. In addition, two open ended questions were given to a batch of students who were following 2nd MBBS course. Two open ended questions were to write 10 good and bad points of a lecture. The selected items were discussed in several focus group discussions to decide on items for the proposed questionnaire. 19 items were identified to make questions.

Formulation of questions

Questions were formulated to fit into a six point adverbial response scale for each selected item.

Content validation

Once the question formulation was completed the questionnaire was discussed in a quality assurance meeting held in the Faculty of Medicine where the participants were the academic staff members. The final questionnaire was formulated after considering the suggestions made in the quality assurance meeting.

Data analysis

Data analysis was done using SPSS statistical software to obtain scores for the following domains; Timing of the lecture, Content of the lecture, Audio-visual presentations of the lecture, Communication skills of the lecturer and Negative aspects of the lecture. In the data analysis, questions were grouped as follows to get the scores for different domains. Timing of the lecture-questions 1,2,14 and 15; Content of the lecture-questions 3,10,11,13,19 and 20; Audio-visual

presentations of the lecture-questions 4 and 5; Communication skills of the lecturer-question 6,7,8,9 and 12; Negative aspects of the lecture- questions 16,17 and 18.
Steps in data analysis (WHO publication 1998))
Step I. cleaning of data- recode the data in to same variable 0=0, 1-=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5, else=sysmis
Step II Getting scores
Compute 'timing' mean.3(q1,q2,q14, q15)*20
Compute 'content' mean.4(q3,q10,q11,q13,q19,q20)*20
Compute 'Audio-visual' mean.2(q4, q5)*20
Compute 'commu' mean.4(q6,q7,q8,q9q12)*20
Compute 'negative' mean.3(q16,q17,q18)*20
The maximum marks possible for a domain was 100 and minimum was 0.
Validation of the instrument: Validation was done by administering the questionnaire to students by three lecturers at the end of four lectures. One lecturer administered the questionnaire at the end of two lectures delivered by him.

Results
Table 1. Mean and SD of scores for domains

	Lecturer A1 (n=62)	Lecturer A2 (n=78)	Lecturer B (n=111)	*Lecturer C (n=103)*
Timing	*72.0±10.2*	*67.9±7.9*	*66.7±10.6*	*55.0±14.2*
Content	*81.2±8.7*	*75.4±10.5*	*75.0±14.2*	*63.0±15.5*
Audio-visual	*85.2±11.3*	*82.8±15.4*	*76.7±18.6*	*70.1±18.8*
Communication	*76.2±11.7*	*78.2±11.5*	*78.3±13.5*	*65.1±16.4*
Negative	*19.3±12.6*	*22.6±16.9*	*27.1±19.4*	*22.4±14.7*

The results show that scores for different domains were different between the lecturers as well as within a lecturer when obtained from two lecturers.

Discussion
There are different ways of assessing a lecture. e.g. getting opinion from students as qualitative method. Giving questionnaire was another method. In most instances data were analysed to find out the number of students responded for each question. In this method number of questions was grouped to look at different aspect of a lecturer as well as one can obtain a score for the pre decided aspects (domain). The results showed that scores obtained for different lectures of one lecturer and between lecturers were different. The developed instrument can be used to assess a lecture under different domains.
In addition one can establish accepted standard for a lecture by having minimum score for the lecturers in a given unit. Lecturer him/her self can identify the weak areas of his/her performances and take action to improve weaknesses. In addition lecturer can find out his/her improvement or deterioration over the years.

Conclusion
The developed instrument can be used to evaluate the quality of a lecture under different domain.

References
Quality Assurance Handbook for Sri Lankan Universities 2002 by Committee of Vice-Chancellors & Directors and University Grant Commission. Annex F page 80
WHOQOL user manual 1998 WHO/MNH/MHP/98.4