

**Compulsory questions on University Student Evaluation of Course (SEC) instruments may not be applicable to a graduate entry medical program - the Griffith University Experience**

Author

Tedman, Raymond, Loudon, Robert, Pountney, Helen

Published

2010

Conference Title

Conference Proceedings of International Association for Medical Education 2010

Rights statement

© The Author(s) 2010. The attached file is reproduced here in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. For information about this conference please refer to the conference's website or contact the authors

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/39222>

Link to published version

<http://www.amee.org/index.asp?pg=132>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Abstract  
Number: 6557

Abstract Title: Compulsory questions on University Student Evaluation of Course (SEC) instruments may not be applicable to a graduate entry medical program – the Griffith University experience.

Abstract  
Authors: R Tedman (1), R Loudon (2), H Pountney (3)

Abstract  
Presenter(s): R Tedman

Abstract  
Contact  
Details: (1) Griffith University, School of Medicine, Gold Coast, Australia (2) Griffith University, School of Medicine, Gold Coast, Australia (3) Griffith University, School of Medicine, Gold Coast, Australia

Abstract: **Background**

It is common practice throughout the world for University students to be asked to complete standardised course evaluation instruments as part of the regular curriculum monitoring and staff development processes. However, are standardised instruments that have been designed for stand-alone, semester-long courses appropriate for integrated, year-long courses characteristic of many medical programs?

**Summary of work**

This paper discusses data collected as part of the University-wide Student Evaluation of Course (SEC) surveys for the four year graduate entry MBBS program during 2008 and 2009 plus data collected through other evaluation systems specifically designed by the School of Medicine for different years of the program.

**Summary of results**

Student comments reveal (1) some confusion regarding interpretation of questions and (2) in at least the Year 3 and 4 course evaluations, the students' Likert scale ratings appear to be referring to aspects of the whole program not just the course that the SEC instrument is supposed to be rating.

**Conclusions**

Our data suggest that some of the compulsory, standardised SEC questions are inappropriate for curriculum monitoring and staff development in an integrated MBBS program.

**Take-home message**

Care must be taken with the use and interpretation of data collected using standardised University-wide Student Evaluation of Course instruments for integrated medical programs, especially in relation to comparisons with stand-alone semester long courses.