

Course and Teaching Evaluation

ACCESS

Assessing Curricula, Courses, Evaluations, Staff & Students System



Office of Educational Services
Faculty of Medicine
Chinese University of Hong Kong

November 2009

Acknowledgement

Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

gratefully acknowledges that the
implementation of ACCESS: Student Evaluation of Courses and Instruction
and the preparation of this manual have been based on
the Instructor Designed Questionnaire (IDQ) System
and its manual produced and provided by

Optical Mark Reading Centre (OMRC),
Department of Computing and Network Services,
The University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
How to Obtain an ACCESS Questionnaire for Your Course / Module / Section	2
Samples of Course Evaluation Form	6
Sample of Request Form	9
Sample of Class Identification Form	10
Sample of Team Teaching Form	11
Sample of Unique Question Form	12
Block-ids for Common or Core Questions	13
Team Teaching Evaluation	13
Reference Groups for Comparative Ratings	13
Instructor Report	14
Administrative Reports	14
Sample of Instructor Report	16
Sample of Aggregate Report	17
Sample of Administrator's Summary	18
<hr/>	
Appendix A – ACCESS Catalogue	19
20 Core Items	20
Illustrative Questions Utilizing Different Rating Scales	21
Student Development	22
Instructor Ratings	23
Course Elements	26
Additional Questions Entered by Individual Instructors or Department / Panel	29
Open-ended Questions	38
Appendix B	39
Examples of Block-ids that generate administrative report	39

Introduction

One method for assisting instructors in their efforts to improve their courses and/or teaching is the collection of feedback from the students.

Unfortunately, student feedback questionnaires can have several shortcomings:

- often, they are designed for meeting the needs of an entire department or faculty, but are too general to help individual instructor;
- often, they contain questions that are not applicable to a particular course or module, and this tends to “put off” both respondents and instructors;
- usually, they lack meaningful norms, and thus, the questionnaire results are difficult to interpret;
- often, instructors feel removed from the process of evaluation and sense that student responses reflect more a measure of the instructor’s popularity than his/her instructional quality.

During the 1995-96 academic year, the Faculty of Medicine implemented of an assessment system for instructors - referred to as ACCESS (Assessing Curricula, Course Evaluations, Staff & Students).

Over time, the ACCESS system eventually includes a variety of teaching aids. One of its components is a modified version of the so-called *instructor designed questionnaire* (IDQ) which begun at the University of Michigan, but was further modified by the University of Alberta. As the system was improved, it successfully addressed more and more of the weaknesses inherent in other student course evaluations by:

- eliminating the problem of irrelevance, since items on each evaluation form are instructor-selected to fit an individual class;
- allowing for inclusion of items relevant to the entire Faculty, Department, and/or instructors;
- involving instructors from start to finish; instructors thus perceive their questionnaire as less of an imposition and more as a helping tool;
- providing normative as well as individualized feedback on the quality of instruction or course’s organization.

With the expert and collegial help of the University of Alberta and its Director of Optical Mark Reading Centre, Mr. Daniel Precht, the system has now been implemented and adapted for use at CUHK’s Faculty of Medicine. Now referred to as the ACCESS, it:

- has a catalog of items, Appendix A, from which each instructor selects items that are most relevant to his/her particular course/module and instructional protocol;

How to Obtain an ACCESS Questionnaire for Your Class/Course/Module

- builds this catalog by adding any item which the instructor wants, but is presently not available;
 - recommends use of questions rated on a scale strongly agree to strongly disagree, but allows for other formats;
 - accommodates use of open-ended questions;
 - prints course evaluation forms (i.e. the questionnaire) containing these item selections; these forms are machine readable;
 - scans, analyzes, and reports student responses for each instructor or designated recipient;
 - provides help for instructors to fill out Request forms, select questions, and interpret results;
 - guards against the possibility of generating erroneous reports (including those which would result from the administration of different versions of a questionnaire within a single class);
 - reduces the time required for production or reprinting of the forms and produces highly accurate, scanned student response data.
1. Consult the ACCESS catalog (Appendix A) to decide which questions you wish to include:
 - a) you may select any of the catalog's questions; and/or
 - b) you may include your own *unique* questions (in this case, include the Unique Question Form, see the sample on page 12);
 - c) total number of questions in each sheet of questionnaire should not exceed 36; and
 - d) up to five questions of these 36 items can be open-ended questions. See catalog questions number 900 or above for possible open-ended questions you might wish to use, or submit your own open-ended items (in this case, include the Unique Question Form, see the sample on page 12).
 2. To generate your questionnaire:
 - a) use the ACCESS REQUEST FORM (see the sample on page 9). Both electronic format and hardcopy are obtainable from OES (Tel: 2145-5233), or can be downloaded from the OES web page at <http://www.oes.cuhk.edu.hk/> ;
 - b) complete a separate ACCESS Request Form for each *different* questionnaire;
 - c) fill in ONE Request Form if:
 - i) several instructors are using the same set of questions (in this case, include the Team Teaching Form, see the sample on page 11), or

- ii) the same questionnaire is to be administered to several different classes (in this case, include the Class Identification Form, see the sample on page 10).
 - d) please allow at least 3 working days for the generation of your questionnaire.
3. Complete the ACCESS Request Form and including the following:
- a. **Identification of Requisitioner** (the person submitting the requisition):
 - i) this is the person who will be contacted by OES if there are problems with the requisition;
 - ii) unless otherwise specified, this will also be the person to whom the machine readable questionnaires will be sent.
 - b. **Item Requisition Grid:**
 - i) 12 items by the University are required items (default);
 - ii) enter the catalog numbers and/or *block-ids* (please refer to page 13 for details) for all questions that you wish to use;
 - iii) the questions will be printed in the sequence that you request them, except that different types of questions will appear in the following order:
 - all questions using a *rating* format of 1-6 (e.g., SD, D, ..., A, SA) will be printed first;
 - questions being repeated for team teaching assessment will be printed next;
 - an *open-ended* format question will be printed last.
 - c. **Instructor Information:**
 - i) print the instructor's name, department/panel, course/class, and module/section as it should appear on the questionnaires and reports;
 - ii) provide information on year of program, teaching protocol, and the date and number of questionnaires required;
 - iii) if the same set of questions apply to a team of teachers or multiple classes, your instructions for such should be provided on the *Team Teaching or Class Identification form* (see samples on pages 11 and 12).
 - d. **Date Required of Questionnaires:**
 - i) indicate the date when you want the questionnaires;
 - ii) you should indicate a date which is 1-2 days prior to the time when the questionnaires will be used, such that corrections, if needed, are possible;
 - iii) please allow 3 working days for OES to prepare your questionnaire.
 - e. **Reports and Selection of Appropriate Reference Group(s):**
 - i) indicate the type of reports required (please refer to pages 14 and 15 for details).
 - ii) you may choose one or more reference groups, the "all classes

in Faculty of Medicine” has been selected by default.

iii) three additional options are provided for you to define the most appropriate reference group for your needs:

- all classes in your department/panel and/or
- similar protocol or course format: lecture, bedside teaching, laboratory/tutorials; and/or
- same program years 1, 2, ..., 5, or 6 for all post-graduate courses.
- same academic year

iv) you may choose one or more of the options, including nesting the options.

f. **Delivery of Reports:**

An option is provided to indicate the individual(s) who should receive the report after computer processing. If you indicate that the report is to be delivered to respective addressees, the report will be mailed directly to the designated parties at the address indicated. The scanned questionnaires will be returned to the Liaison Secretary.

g. **Date Required of Reports:**

- i) indicate the date when you prefer to receive the report;
- ii) please note that upon receiving the completed questionnaires, the OES normally requires *3 working days* to scan, analyze and generate a report of students responses to items, and *2 weeks* for typing up their written comments.

h. **Team Teaching, Class Identification, and Unique Question Attachments:**

Please indicate the number of attachment pages accompanying the ACCESS Request Form so that OES can ensure that the complete request has been received.

4. Submitting the ACCESS Request Form:

- a. xerox and retain for your reference a copy of the ACCESS Request Form and any attachments;
- b. staple the original attachment page(s), if any, to the ACCESS Request Form;
- c. forward the completed Request Form to OES, Flat 9A, Block B, Staff Quarters, Prince of Wales Hospital, Shatin, N.T.

5. Administering the questionnaire:

- a. you may wish to bear in mind that research has shown that student evaluation of courses and instruction should occur prior to the last week of classes;

- b. before administering the questionnaire, please consult the return slip which is included with your printed questionnaires;
 - c. it is recommended that the students be informed of the purpose of the questionnaire and are encouraged to complete it because you intend to use their feedback as part of your efforts to improve the course;
 - d. the instructor should not be in the classroom while students are filling out the forms and should arrange a third party, for example, Liaison Secretary (Clerical Officer, Executive Officer or Technician), to collect the completed questionnaires;
 - e. remind students to use **HB** pencils, blue and black pens to fill the ACCESS questionnaire, and that they must not fold or rumple the questionnaire;
 - f. questionnaires filled in by pen and rumpled questionnaires that jam the scanner are rejected and not analyzed.
6. Submitting the completed questionnaires for scanning and analyses:
- a. it is important to return the completed questionnaires to OES as soon as possible; up to *three working days* will be needed for processing, analysing and preparing the reports;
 - b. please ensure that questionnaires from different classes are not mixed when forwarding to OES for processing; and
 - c. please **DO NOT** fold the questionnaires, use *clips* or *large elastic band* to hold, if necessary.
7. If you have questions regarding the processing of your requisition, please have your Request *No.* available when you phone OES at 2145-5233.
8. The Request Number is composed of the code of your department/panel, the academic year (2 digits), and the sequence number (2 digits) of orders from a department/panel.
Illustration:

Request No.: PCLM-01-04

where PCLM is code for Panel of Clinical Methods,
01 is the academic year of 2001-2002, and
04 is the fourth requisition order of the PCLM.

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

WCC00CU05 TMK03961

ACCESS: Faculty of Medicine, CUHK

Instructor's name: _____

Course/Class: _____

PLEASE DO NOT DISTURB

THIS AREA

Requisition # 000472.009

Using an HB pencil, fill in only one circle for each question. Completely erase any response you wish to change.
 1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly disagree 4=Slightly agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree

1. I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.
2. I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.
3. The course was well organized.
4. The objectives of the course were clearly defined.
5. The amount of material covered in the course was reasonable.
6. The level of difficulty of the course material was appropriate.
7. Overall, I am satisfied with the course.
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).
9. The instructor presented the material in an interesting and helpful manner.
10. The instructor provided an atmosphere conducive to learning.
11. The course stimulated me to want to learn more in this area.
12. The objectives of the course were achieved.
13. The instructor made the course difficult enough to be stimulating.
14. I learned to think critically about the subject matter.
15. The pace of the course was appropriate.
16. The workload for this course was appropriate.
17. The material in this course is relevant to my needs.
18. The topics covered in lectures were relevant to the course objectives.
19. The lecture component of the course was well organized.
20. The laboratory component of the course was well organized.
21. The lecture and lab components of the course were well synchronized.
22. The laboratory was a valuable part of this course.
23. Laboratory assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.
24. A textbook would be a useful addition to this course.
25. The quality of teaching materials in practicals was excellent.

SAMPLE

If you have any additional comments, please use the back of this sheet.

Sample of Course Evaluation Form for Multiple Topics/Sessions

COURSE EVALUATION FORM		WCC00CU05 TMK03961
ACCESS: Faculty of Medicine, CUHK		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 0 auto; width: 150px;"> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: x-small;">PLEASE DO NOT DISTURB</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: x-small;">THIS AREA</div> </div>
Instructor's name: _____	Department A (01/02)	Requisition # 000541.001
Course/Class: _____	Medical Year 2	
<p style="font-size: x-small;">Using an HB pencil, fill in only one circle for each question. Completely erase any response you wish to change.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly disagree 4=Slightly agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree</p>		
BED-SIDE TEACHING AND TUTORIALS		
1. The Team Bed-side teaching was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
2. The Medical Officer Bed-side teaching was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
3. The Evening Teaching Ward Round was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
4. The Wednesday morning Bed-side teaching was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
5. The Wednesday afternoon radiology tutorial was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
SAMPLE		
6. The Friday morning haematology tutorials were good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
7. The time allocated to the Bed-side teaching was appropriate.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
OUTPATIENT CLINICS		
8. The General Team Outpatient Clinic Sessions was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
9. The Neonatal Outpatient Clinic Session was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
10. The Cardiology Outpatient Clinic Session were good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
11. The Growth & Endocrine Outpatient Clinic Session was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
12. The Oncology & Haematology Outpatient Clinic Session was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
13. The Neurology Outpatient Clinic Session was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
14. The time allocated to the Outpatient Clinic Session was appropriate.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
15. The Saturday morning teaching was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
OTHER INSTITUTIONS		
16. Visit to Caritas Medical Centre was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
17. Visit to Kwong Wah Hospital was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
18. Visit to United Christian Hospital was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
19. Visit to Princess Margaret Hospital was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
20. Visit to Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
21. Visit to Hong Chi Pinehill School was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
22. Visit to MCH Clinic was good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
23. Visits to Pamela Youde Child Assessment Centre were good.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
24. The time allocated to these visits to other institutions was appropriate.		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
<p>Please use the back of this sheet to respond to the following:</p> <p>A. How might this module be improved?</p> <p>B. Should any topics be added to or deleted from the Introductory Lecture course?</p> <p>C. Should any topics be added to or deleted from the Friday Topic Teaching course?</p> <p>D. Please comment on the usefulness of "Problem-oriented" case presentation (Friday PM).</p>		
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> 123456 </div>

Sample of Course Evaluation Form for Multiple Teachers

	COURSE	EVALUATION	FORM
ACCESS: Faculty of Medicine, CUHK		WCC00CU05 TMK03961	
Instructor's name: _____ Course/Class: Dept A: Med 4, Mod I (02/03)		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 0 auto; width: 150px;"> PLEASE DO NOT DISTURB  THIS AREA </div>	
		Requisition # 000701.011	
Using an HB pencil, fill in only one circle for each question. Completely erase any response you wish to change. 1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly disagree 4=Slightly agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree			
With respect to: Prof Cynthia Chan			
1. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof J A Dickinson			
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof Suzanne Ho			
3. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof Edith Lau			
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof Albert Lee			
5. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof J L Tang			
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof Wong Tze Wai			
7. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
With respect to: Prof William Wong			
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).			<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: x-small;"> 123456 </div> 
If you have any additional comments, please use the back of this sheet.			

Requisitioner's Name

Department / Panel

Requisitioner's Signature

Deliver Printed Questionnaires To

ITEM REQUISITION GRID

Enter the ACCESS catalog question numbers and/or Block-ids corresponding to those items that you wish to include in the student feedback questionnaire. Please refer to the ACCESS catalog for appropriate questions.

7004	7005	7006	7007	7008	7009	7010	7011	270
7012	7013	7020	7014	7015	7016	7017	7018	7019
812	813	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

- ◆ For unique question(s), which does not appear in the ACCESS catalog, please write them on the "Unique Question Attachment" form.
- ◆ For multiple classes using the same set of questions: please use the "Class Identification" form to provide information for each class.
- ◆ For team teaching activities: please use the "Team Teaching" form to list the instructors who comprise of one team and identify questions, which will be repeated for each instructor.

Instructor's Name: (to be shown on questionnaire)

Department / Panel: (to be shown on questionnaire)

Course / Class: (to be shown on questionnaire)

Module / Section: (to be shown on questionnaires)

Year of Program:

Protocol: (Lecture / Laboratory or Tutorial / Bedside Teaching)

No. of Questionnaires Required:

Date of Questionnaires Required:

Report(s) required:	Reference Group: cross (x) the type(s) you wish to use:
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor Report	<input type="checkbox"/> All classes in the Faculty of Medicine (default) <input type="checkbox"/> All classes in the Department / Panel <input type="checkbox"/> Same Year <input type="checkbox"/> Similar Protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Year
<input type="checkbox"/> Aggregate Report	<input type="checkbox"/> All classes in the Faculty of Medicine (default) <input type="checkbox"/> All classes in the Department / Panel <input type="checkbox"/> Same Year <input type="checkbox"/> Similar Protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Year

Send Reports to:

- ☐ Chair (name specified) -
- ☐ Requisitioner (name specified) -
- ☐ Corresponding instructor(s) (name specified) -
- ☐ Others (specified) -

Mailing Address:

Date of Reports Required:

No. of pages attached to this Request Form:

Mail this Request Form with any attached pages to:

OES – Miss Diana Kwan, Flat 9A, Block B, Staff Quarters, Prince of Wales Hospital (Telephone: 2145-5233)

CLASS IDENTIFICATION for ACCESS Request # _____

For multiple classes that use the same set of questions, please use this form to provide information of each class.

[illegible]

TEAM TEACHING for ACCESS Request # _____

For team teaching activities, please use this form to list out the instructors of the team and identify questions which will be repeated for each instructor.

Questions to be repeated	Instructors' names
813	

UNIQUE QUESTION for ACCESS Request # _____

Please provide on this form the “write-in” questions that you wish to add to the ACCESS questionnaires. Each line may have a maximum of 92 characters, including punctuation and spaces. Please remember to write in the Request Number (above).

[illegible]

Block-ids for Common or Core Questions

ACCESS also supports having a common subset of questions for a program, department, or the Faculty. The common subset of questions (which apply to all courses within a particular unit) may also be augmented with additional questions relevant to each particular class/course/module.

To use this feature, a 4-character code is used to denote a subset of questions, called “block-id”. When selecting questions for a given questionnaire, one selects one or more of these subsets of items simply by specifying the appropriate block-id(s) (see Appendix B, for some sample subsets). Departments or programs wishing to make use of this feature and who wish to create other subsets should contact OES staff who will assist with defining and implementing your desired block-id(s). Once this has been put into operation, it is the responsibility of the coordinator within the academic department/panel committee to disseminate information concerning usage of the block-id to the related staff members. When block-id that begins with 1, 2, or 3 (see Appendix B) is selected, report is automatically generated for this block of common questions.

Team Teaching Evaluation

ACCESS supports the collection of students’ ratings for classes which involve team teaching. This feature allows for questions that concern the overall course *per se*, and an additional set of questions that are relevant to each of the instructors of a single class. This feature applies to all phases, from generating a questionnaire (which includes the course-related questions plus a set of instructor-related questions repeated for all instructors involved) to providing separate reports for the course-related questions and for each of the instructors involved in the course/module.

If you are not sure how to use this feature initially, please feel free to call OES for assistance in generating your first requisition.

Reference Groups for Comparative Ratings

ACCESS accumulates ratings for each question used in each course/module in order to provide comparative data for ensuing reports. By default, the comparative data are derived from the reference group consisting of all courses in the Faculty to which a particular question has been administered. Alternatively, you may request that the reference group be restricted to courses having class sizes similar to your own class. ACCESS automatically groups classes according to sizes as follow: (1) 1-15 students, (2) 16-40 students, (3) 41-100 students, (4) 101+ students.

Normed data can also be grouped by Faculty (default) or department, by year 1 to 5 and graduate level (6), and by instructional format (lecture, bedside, laboratory/tutorial). You may ask for any of these three variables with or without comparable class sizes in order to define a reference group of your choice.

Please note that increasing the specificity of these choices will often result in selection of a relatively small reference group which, in turn, will result in unstable estimates of the quartile ranks. As a precaution, if the reference group does not consist of more than 15 classes/courses/modules, the message “*too few uses for rating*” will appear rather than the desired reference data.

It may take a year or more to cumulate reference data for any new item.

Instructor Report

A one-page report is generated for each class/course/module that has been evaluated. The Instructor Report contains the text of each of the *rating* questions appearing in the questionnaire. The questions are reported in the sequence that are printed on the questionnaire, but are numbered using their catalog reference numbers. If the question is a *unique* question, XXX is printed to indicate that the question is not presently part of the ACCESS catalog. Since no mechanism is available for summarizing the open-ended questions, these are not referenced in the report.

Following the text of each question, the numbers of students responding to the 6-point rating scale (i.e. 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree) are reported. These frequencies are followed by the median rating of these responses. For the questions selected from the catalog, the median is followed by three percentiles indicating comparative median ratings obtained by other instructors who have used this same question. Following these comparative ratings, the total number of classes used to derive the reference data is reported. If there has been insufficient usage of a question to generate comparative ratings, the text “*too few uses for rating*” will appear. Obviously, comparative data cannot be reported for *unique* questions.

The comparative ratings are provided as an indication of what your median may represent. In the sample Instructor Report (page 16), the *ranks of medians from other classes* indicate that 25 percent of the classes rated on catalog question 120 received median ratings below 4.4; 50 percent of the classes were given median ratings below 4.42, and 75 percent of the classes were given median ratings below 4.72. Note, then, that Prof. A was given a median rating of 4.4 for question 101, which is below the 25th percentile (4.29) for all classes rated. On the other hand, a median rating of 4.2 was also obtained for catalog question 296, but this is above the 25th percentile. Relative to other instructors, one would conclude that an obtained rating of 4.2 on question 102 is actually better than a rating of 4.2 on question 296.

In conclusion, it is important to keep in mind that the precision of the instructor’s median rating is affected by the number of students responding to the question, while the precision of the comparative ratings is affected by the number of classes that have been rated on the same question.

Administrative Reports

1. Administrative Copies of the Instructor Report:

ACCESS provides the option of generating additional copies of the Instructor Report for administrative purposes. Only the questions referenced in the associated block-id are reported in aggregate report and administrator’s summary. Items selected by individual instructor are only reported to the particular instructor.

2. Aggregate Report:

The Aggregate Report (see sample on page 17) collates the responses from a number of courses/classes/modules into a single report. This option might be most appropriate for situations involving a number of sections within a course when a subset of questions focuses on evaluating features associated with the course *per se* rather than with individual instructors. Provided that the subset of questions has been requested via inclusion of the appropriate block-id on the ACCESS Requisition form, the administrator may request that the responses gathered from the various sections be aggregated into a single Aggregate Report.

There are two differences in presentation between this report and the Instructor Report.

- a) The tally of responses to the questions are presented as percentages rather than raw frequency counts.
- b) The option is provided for selecting the Reference Group to consist of only the individual classes which have been included in the aggregation for the report.

When using the above option, information gleaned from the percentile rank of the Reference Group medians is not so much concerned with indicating how the obtained median compares with medians from other classes, but rather, with indicating the variability of the medians of the classes which have been aggregated for inclusion in the report.

As illustrated (page 17), the Aggregate Report begins with a list describing the classes which have been included in the aggregation.

3. Administrator's Summary:

The Administrator's Summary (see sample on page 18) is restricted to reporting only the subset of questions which are associated with a block-id (as done with the Aggregate Report). It allows for the possibility of restricting the Reference Group to only the classes which are listed in the current report.

The Administrator's Summary summarizes the results for a number of classes in a condensed format. As illustrated in the sample, this is accomplished by reporting the results for each class on a single line with the medians for each question assigned in a column under the corresponding reference data. For convenience, an additional page is provided which indicates the text that corresponds to the question numbers appearing in the main body of the report.

A distinctive feature of the Administrator's Summary is that it bold-faces those medians which exceed the 75th percentile of the class medians in the Reference Group (provided that the class median is computed from a minimum of 6 responses).

Sample of Instructor Report

ACCESS: I.D.Q.
The Faculty of Medicine's
Instructor-Designed Questionnaire System
Requisition Number: 000XXX-XXX

Instructor Report
Academic Year 2000/01
Class: XXXXXXXXXX
Instructor: Prof. A

AUG 16, 2001

ITEM	RESPONSES FROM YOUR STUDENTS						YOUR MEDIAN	RANKS OF MEDIAN FROM OTHER CLASSES				
	1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly Disagree	4=Slightly Agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4		5	6	25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile
Please answer all of the following questions:												
101 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	0	0	0	10	5	0	4.2	4.29	4.63	4.87	3291	
120 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	0	0	0	8	7	0	4.4	4.05	4.42	4.72	1008	
270 The course was well organized.	0	0	0	9	6	0	4.3	4.01	4.37	4.71	1071	
276 The objectives of the course were clearly defined.	0	0	0	8	7	0	4.4	4.09	4.45	4.71	1002	
292 The amount of material covered in the course weas reasonable.	0	0	0	6	9	0	4.7	Too few uses for rating.				
296 The level of difficulty of the course material was appropriate.	0	0	1	9	5	0	4.2	3.90	4.33	4.61	1029	
812 Overall, I am satisfied with the course.	0	0	0	7	8	0	4.6	4.08	4.50	4.80	260	
813 Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).	0	0	0	6	9	0	4.7	4.34	4.71	4.97	1768	

Number of students responding to questionnaire: 15

Reference Group consists of FACULTY OF Medicine Courses

Sample of Aggregate Report

Classes included in this Aggregate Report			
000XXX-XXX	7 Students	Department of XXX	Medical Year X (Team A1)
000XXX-XXX	7 Students	Department of XXX	Medical Year X (Team A2)
000XXX-XXX	8 Students	Department of XXX	Medical Year X (Team B1)
000XXX-XXX	6 Students	Department of XXX	Medical Year X (Team B2)
000XXX-XXX	8 Students	Department of XXX	Medical Year X (Team C1)

ACCESS The Faculty of Medicine's Instructor-Designed Questionnaire System	Attn: XXXXXXXXXX	Aggregate Report Academic Year 2000/01 Classes: listed on previous page(s)	AUG 09, 2001
---	---------------------	--	--------------

		1=Strongly Disagree	4=Slightly Agree		PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES						RANKS OF MEDIAN FROM REFERENCE GROUP			
		2=Disagree	5=Agree	MEDIAN							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	Total Classes
ITEM		1	2	3	4	5	6							
Please answer all of the following questions:														
688	The instructor had adequate knowledge of the subject.	0	0	0	6	47	47	5.44	4.75	5.02	5.29	600		
810	The instructor was well prepared for classes.	0	0	3	14	61	22	5.05	4.47	4.82	5.05	600		
749	The instructor was clear in presentation.	0	0	0	14	56	28	5.12	4.50	4.84	5.12	600		
759	The variety and quality of illustrative examples were satisfactory.	0	0	3	11	56	28	5.12	5.34	4.78	5.03	600		
762	The instructor was able to arouse students' interests in subject matter.	0	0	3	17	42	39	5.23	4.33	4.77	5.02	600		
736	The instructor was responsive to questions and comments.	0	0	0	8	56	36	5.25	4.60	4.88	5.11	600		
763	The instructor respected students' opinion and concerns.	0	0	0	8	53	39	5.29	5.40	4.83	5.05	600		
236	The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	0	0	0	17	53	28	5.11	4.15	4.56	4.96	900		
764	The instructor had enthusiasm and sense of responsibility in teaching.	0	0	3	17	36	44	5.35	4.48	4.84	5.08	600		
765	The instructor was open to criticism.	0	0	3	25	36	33	5.08	4.21	4.62	4.96	600		
813	Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).	0	0	3	11	28	36	5.40	4.32	4.75	5.02	3032		

Number of students responding to questionnaire: 36

Reference Group consists of FACULTY OF Medicine Courses

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding or because of student failure to respond to the question.

Sample of Administrator's Summary

ACCESS The Faculty of Medicine's Instructor-Designed Questionnaire System Requisition Number: 000XXX-XXX, etc	Attn: XXXXXXXXXX	Administrator's Summary Academic Year 2000/01 IDQ Catalog=ACCESS	AUG 09, 2001
--	---------------------	---	--------------

Question #:	101	120	270	276	292	296
25th %ile:	3.58	3.52	3.49	3.62	3.56	3.34
50th %ile:	3.84	3.79	3.74	3.80	3.82	3.66
75th %ile:	4.01	4.00	3.88	3.94	4.01	3.84

Instructor	Course	Resp	Class Medians (Values exceeding 75th %ile are bold-faced)					
Prof AA	Med X (Team 1)	12	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1
Prof AA	Med X (Team 2)	13	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9
Prof AA	Med X (Team 3)	12	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0
Prof AA	Med X (Team 4)	12	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.7	3.1
Prof AA	Med X (Team 5)	12	3.9	3.5	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.7
Prof AA	Med X (Team 6)	11	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6

Reference Group consists of ALL Courses.

If the number of Respondents (shown in column "Resp") is bold-faced, it is suggested that the class is too small to be used in comparisons.

ACCESS The Faculty of Medicine's Instructor-Designed Questionnaire System Requisition Number: 000XXX-XXX, etc	Attn: XXXXXXXXXX	Administrator's Summary Academic Year 2000/01 IDQ Catalog=ACCESS	AUG 09, 2001
--	---------------------	---	--------------

101 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.
 120 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.
 270 The course was well organized.
 276 The objectives of the course were clearly defined.
 292 The amount of material covered in the course was reasonable.
 296 The level of difficulty of the course material was appropriate.

ACCESS Catalog
(revised August 2000)

The questions in the ACCESS catalog are worded to be consistent with the rating scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree**
- 2 = Disagree**
- 3 = Slightly disagree**
- 4 = Slightly agree**
- 5 = Agree**
- 6 = Strongly agree**

When a different coding is necessary, it needs to be supplied along with the text of the question as illustrated for questions numbered 11 through 14 on the following page.

ACCESS accommodates questions which require more than one line of text. Note that selection of such questions will reduce the total number of questions that can appear on the questionnaire (by the number equivalent to the extra lines that are used for these longer questions).

20 CORE ITEMS

University

- 7004. The teacher presented in a clear manner.
- 7005. The teacher used relevant examples to assist my learning.
- 7006. The teacher was enthusiastic about teaching.
- 7007. The teacher encouraged active participation in class.
- 7008. There was effective communication between the teacher and students.
- 7009. The course was interesting.
- 7010. The course was stimulating.
- 7011. The course enhanced my knowledge in this subject.
- 270. The course was well organized.
- 7012. Learning outcomes of the course were clear.
- 7013. Assessment methods were appropriate.
- 7020. The amount of workload required was appropriate.
- 7014. I found the amount of work required for assessment (1 = too much; 2 = too little).
- 7015. Recommended readings were useful.
- 7016. Course content was of appropriate difficulty.
- 7017. I found the course content (1 = too difficult; 2 = too simple).
- 7018. The course was well supported by library resources.
- 7019. The course was well supported by IT resources.
- 812. Overall, I am satisfied with the course.
- 813. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the teacher(s).

ILLUSTRATIVE QUESTIONS

Utilizing Different Rating Scales

1. Overall, this was an excellent course.
 2. Overall, the instructor was effective.
 3. The instructor was well prepared.
 4. The instructor was well organized.
 5. The instructor explained concepts clearly.
 6. The instructor was enthusiastic.
 7. The instructor was helpful.
 8. The instructor motivated me to do my best work.
 9. I felt that I was performing up to my potential in this course.
 10. I had a strong desire to take this course.
- * 11. This course was 1 = A requirement, 2 = An elective, 3 = Other.
- * 12. My university year is 1 = First, 2 = Second, 3 = Third, 4 = Fourth, 5 = Fifth.
- * 13. My age is 1 = under 25, 2 = 25 or over.
- * (For the next question, use 1= Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent)
14. Overall, how do you rate your instructor in this course?

* *If you plan to use a rating scale that is different than Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6), these illustrative examples demonstrate the various ways you may do so.*

For questions 1 to 10, the standard rating scale (i.e., Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) would apply.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Knowledge and Skills	12.	My university year is 1=First; 2=Second; 3=Third; 4=Fourth; 5=Fifth.
	13.	My age is 1=under 25; 2=25 or over.
	100.	I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.
	101.	I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.
	102.	I learned to apply principles from this course to new situations.
	103.	I learned to identify main points and central issues in this field.
	105.	I developed the ability to solve real problems in this field.
	107.	I developed the ability to communicate clearly about this subject.
	111.	I learned a lot in this course.
	112.	I learned a lot in this course from the instructor.
	143.	The clinical skills assessments were good.
	310.	I developed the ability to think critically through case assignments.
	311.	I developed the ability to solve problems in real patients through case assignments.
	323.	I developed the ability to communicate effectively through case presentation workshops.
	341.	I developed sufficient competent in using computer through completion of course assignments.
	364.	I learnt how to communicate with physicians.
	671.	I learned communication skill - history taking, etc.
	672.	I learned to elicit physical signs.
	673.	I learned to define and solve patient's problems.
	674.	I understood patients' health problems in relation to family & community.
	675.	I learned patient education.
	676.	I learned practice management.
	677.	I was provided with opportunity to practise.
	678.	I desire to pursue this field further.
Interest and Curiosity	120.	I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.
	121.	I developed enthusiasm about the course material.
	122.	I was stimulated to do outside reading about the course material.
	123.	I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.
	126.	The course challenged me intellectually.
	128.	The course stimulated me to want to learn more in this area.
	822.	I was encouraged to become involved, ask questions, and take part in discussions.
Social Skills and Attitudes Self Concept	133.	I became interested in community projects related to the course.
	137.	I would recommend this course to other students.
	140.	I gained a better understanding of myself through this course.
	142.	I developed a greater sense of personal responsibility.
Vocational Skills & Attitudes	144.	I developed more confidence in myself.
	150.	I developed skills needed by professionals in this field.
Student Responsibility	152.	I developed a clearer sense of professional identity.
	160.	I actively participated in class discussions.
	161.	I tried to relate what I learned in this course to my own experience.
	162.	I attended class regularly.
	163.	I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in the course.
	164.	I created my own learning experiences in connection with the course.
	165.	I helped classmates learn.

INSTRUCTOR RATINGS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Instructor Skill	2.	Overall, the instructor was effective.
	3.	The instructor was well prepared.
	4.	The instructor was well organized.
	5.	The instructor explained concepts clearly.
	6.	The instructor was enthusiastic.
	7.	The instructor was helpful.
	8.	The instructor motivated me to do my best work.
	14.	(For the next question use 1=Poor; 2= Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent) Overall, how do you rate your instructor in this course?
	200.	The instructor(s) gave clear explanations.
	201.	The instructor made good use of examples and illustrations.
	202.	The instructor(s) stressed important points in lectures or discussions.
	203.	The instructor presented the material in an interesting way.
	205.	The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.
	206.	The instructor seemed knowledgeable in many areas.
	207.	The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.
	209.	The instructor was sensitive to student difficulties with course work.
	211.	The instructor spoke audibly and clearly.
	213.	The instructor provided an atmosphere conducive to learning.
	214.	The instructor offered a rich and substantial course content.
	215.	Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the SSM tutor/mentor.
	216.	The instructor was sensitive to individual ways and speeds of learning.
	217.	The instructor seemed concerned with whether students learned the material.
	218.	The instructor presented the material in an interesting and helpful manner.
	7219.	The instructor presented abstract ideas and theories clearly.
	220.	The instructor made the course sufficiently challenging.
	221.	Overall, the instructor was excellent.
	222.	Overall, this course was among the best I have taken.
	420.	The teacher appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.
	421.	The teacher made good use of examples and illustrations.
	423.	The teacher offered a rich and substantial course content.
	424.	The teacher presented the material in an interesting and helpful manner.
	435.	The teacher facilitated student's integration of theory to practice, where appropriate.
	437.	The teacher encouraged intellectual thought.
	441.	The teacher seemed knowledgeable in many areas.
	450.	The teacher(s) was/were well prepared.
	451.	The teacher(s) gave clear explanations.
	452.	The teacher was helpful.
	664.	The instructor always arrived on time for teaching.
	665.	The instructor was clear and organized.
	666.	The instructor provided direction and feedback.
	667.	The instructor demonstrated clinical skills during bedside teaching.
	824.	In comparison to other modules, the quality of instruction was excellent.
	827.	The quality of teaching was good.
	617.	The instructor's lecture style maintained my attention and interest.
	638.	The instructor was effective in communicating the material.
	639.	The instructor was on time for class.
	640.	The instructor was not absent from class without announcement.
	663.	The instructor presented the material in a manner that helped me to learn.
	752.	The teacher(s) had thorough knowledge of the subject.
	753.	The teacher(s) was/were well organized.
	754.	The teacher(s) encouraged class participation.
	769.	I find the instructor's explanation clear and easy to understand.
	772.	Overall, I can benefit from the teaching of the instructor.
	810.	The instructor was well prepared for classes.
	7420.	The teaching assistant appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.

INSTRUCTOR RATINGS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Instructor (continued) Rapport	Skill	
	2451.	The teacher gave clear explanations.
	230.	The instructor was friendly.
	232.	The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in the class.
	233.	The instructor acknowledged all questions insofar as possible.
	234.	The instructor treated students with respect.
	236.	The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.
	237.	The instructor was reasonably accessible outside of class.
	240.	The instructor had a good rapport with the class.
	241.	The instructor(s) was/were helpful in answering questions.
	242.	The lecturer was helpful in answering questions.
	349.	The supervisor provided sufficient supervision and feedback toward various aspects of my project.
	350.	The supervisor provided supportive idea toward various aspects of my project.
	422.	The teacher provided an atmosphere conducive to learning.
	425.	The teacher was willing to help students outside of class.
	442.	The teacher gave individual attention to students in the course.
Interaction	251.	A real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.
	252.	Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.
	253.	The instructor was open to ideas from members of the class.
	254.	There was positive interaction between students and instructor.
	255.	Class participation was actively encouraged.
	313.	Peer assessment activities improve my ability to acknowledge the strengths of others.
	321.	Peer assessment activities improve my ability to provide constructive feedbacks.
Feedback	426.	There was positive interaction between students and the teacher
	260.	The instructor suggested specific ways students could improve.
	261.	The instructor told students when they had done particularly well.
	263.	The instructor provided helpful feedback throughout this course.
Organization	427.	The teacher suggested specific ways that I could improve on my assignments.
	91.	The amount of material covered in the lecture was appropriate.
	151.	The choice of topics for selection was good.
	250.	The objectives of the lecture were clearly defined.
	262.	Overall, I am satisfied with the lecture.
	270.	The course was well organized.
	271.	The course material was clearly presented.
	272.	The tutorial was well organized.
	273.	The instructor followed an outline closely.
	274.	The instructor used class time well.
	275.	The objectives of the course were achieved.
	276.	The objectives of the course were clearly defined.
	278.	The work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.
	279.	The procedures for determining grades were satisfactory.
	282.	The pace of the course was appropriate.
	434.	The lecture content of the course was well organized.
	436.	The course objectives were clearly achieved.
	510.	The format of the course was appropriate.
	511.	The range and depth of subjects covered in the course were reasonable.
	600.	The pace of the lectures was appropriate.
	726.	The length of the lecture was appropriate.
	792.	The number of topics covered was appropriate.
	793.	The time allocated to each topic was sufficient.
	804.	The lecture content was well organised.
	821.	The course was well designed.
	825.	The content was useful.

INSTRUCTOR RATINGS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Organization (continued)	826.	The time allocated was appropriate.
	843.	The sequence of the topics was appropriate.
	848.	The lectures were well integrated with the tutorials and practicals.
	852.	The lecture outline was a useful guide to the lectures
Difficulty	290.	The amount of work required was appropriate for the credit received.
	291.	The workload for this course was appropriate.
	292.	The amount of material covered in the course was reasonable.
	293.	The instructor set high standards for students.
	294.	The instructor made the course difficult enough to be stimulating.
	296.	The level of difficulty of the course material was appropriate.

COURSE ELEMENTS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Assignments	1. 300. 301. 303. 304. 305. 306. 308. 312. 429. 430. 438. 439. 799.	Overall, this was an excellent course. Assignments were challenging and worthwhile. Written assignments (papers, problem sets) seemed carefully chosen. Written assignments made students think. Directions for written assignments were clear and specific. Written assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort. Written assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. Written assignments were returned promptly. The case assignments motivate my self-directed learning. Directions for assignments were clear and specific. Assignments were graded fairly. The assignments were related to the course objectives. Relevant examples from practice were used to increase understanding. The project was a useful part of the course.
Laboratory / Practicals / Demonstration	320. 322. 324. 325. 326. 476. 484. 485. 836. 837. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 890. 891.	The laboratory was a valuable part of this course. Laboratory assignments were interesting and stimulating. Directions for laboratory assignments were clear and specific. Laboratory assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort. Laboratory assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. The tutorial/practical was well organized. The practical/demonstration were a valuable part of this course. The practical/demonstration were well organized. Laboratory facilities were adequate. There were sufficient staff present to help students during practicals. The length of each practical was appropriate. The depth and complexity of the practicals were appropriate. The practicals were helpful in the learning of the subject. The practical manual was a useful guide to the practicals. The demonstrators were well prepared. The practical group size was appropriate. Laboratory facilities were adequate. The demonstration/practical was well conducted. The laboratory quiz was of appropriate levels and stimulating.
Exams	124. 125. 131. 132. 134. 208. 212. 248. 328. 340. 342. 344. 345. 347. 348. 352. 353. 354. 409.	This examination did not cause extra stress. This exam gave good coverage of the undergraduate surgical syllabus. The exam was generally what I expected. I would still prepare myself in the same way if I took this exam again. Senior students are the best source and give the most accurate information about exams. Developing a R-type MCQ was useful. The R-type MCQ exam (week 8) was good. The formative MCQs tests were good. The exam covered the important aspects of the lectures. The exams covered the important aspects of the course. The exams covered the lecture material well. The tests/examinations were reasonable in length and difficulty. The exam items were clearly worded. The exams were graded very carefully and fairly. The exam items were adequately explained after the test was given. The test covered the important aspects of the course. The test covered the lecture material well. The tests/examinations results generally reflect the academic competence of students. Overall, I am satisfied with using assignment/presentation as a form of

COURSE ELEMENTS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Exams (continued)		assessment.
	682.	The formative MCQ was a good exercise.
	739.	MCQ development was useful.
	809.	The tests were fair.
	867.	The examinations were comprehensive and fair.
Grading		
	360.	Grades were assigned fairly and impartially.
	361.	The grading system was clearly explained.
	363.	The instructor had a realistic definition of good performance.
	797.	The level of difficulty of assessments was appropriate.
Tutorials		
	277.	The tutorial was interactive.
	280.	The amount of tutorials is appropriate.
	302.	The Evidence Based Medicine tutorial was a good learning experience.
	401.	The teaching assistant(s) gave clear and understandable explanations.
	7420.	The teaching assistant appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.
	404.	The teaching assistant was skillful in observing student reactions.
	408.	The teachers/tutors gave adequate assistance in helping me complete the assignment/presentation.
	411.	Overall, I am satisfied with the tutorial.
	431.	The tutorials were a valuable part of the course.
	502.	The amount of material covered in the tutorial was reasonable.
	512.	I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this tutorial.
	516.	The objectives of the tutorial were clearly defined.
	520.	The tutor had thorough knowledge of the subject.
	668.	The tutor provided a good insight into the reality of General Practice.
	712.	I learnt most from the tutorials and workshops.
	744.	The tutorial was a valuable part of the course.
	853.	The length of each tutorial was appropriate.
	854.	The depth and complexity of the tutorials were appropriate.
	855.	The tutor(s) was/were well prepared.
	856.	The tutorial group size was appropriate.
	857.	There were ample opportunities to raise questions during tutorials.
	892.	The tutor gave clear explanations.
	893.	The tutor seemed to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.
	894.	The tutor encouraged class participation.
	895.	Overall, how did you rate your tutor?
		(For this question, use 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent)
Teaching material		
	21.	The textbooks/reading materials are easily accessible.
	400.	It helped my understanding of the subject matter.
	432.	The course reading materials made a valuable contribution to the course.
	500.	The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.
	501.	The textbook was easy to read and understand.
	503.	A textbook would be a useful addition to this course.
	440.	The course material gave me a different perspective on the subject.
	648.	The workload was appropriate.
	649.	The teaching material was useful.
	715.	The lecture handouts were relevant and useful.
	796.	The quality of study guides was good.
	833.	The textbook were well adapted to the requirements of the course.
	850.	The recommended textbooks/reading materials were appropriate for the course.
	852.	The lecture outline was a useful guide to the lectures.
Media		
	433.	Audio Visual Aids were a valuable part of this course.
	513.	Videotapes were a valuable part of this course.
	514.	Videotapes used in this course were interesting and stimulating.
	515.	Videotapes used in this course were a great help to learning.

COURSE ELEMENTS

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Media (continued)	517.	Slides used in this course were interesting and stimulating.
	433.	Audio Visual Aids were a valuable part of this course.
E-learning	410.	The e-learning platform were a valuable part of the course.
	685.	The e-learning platform is update.
	719.	The e-learning platform is user-friendly.
	713.	I learnt most from the E-learning resources.
	720.	I prefer moodle to webCT.
	721.	Overall, I am satisfied with the current e-learning platform.
Others	823.	The workload required of me compared to other modules was reasonable.
	824.	In comparison to other modules, the quality of instruction was excellent.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Department of Anaesthesia & Intensive Care	82.	The case presentation assignments are valuable.
	637.	Exposure to emergency anaesthesia is valuable.
	699.	The virtual patient scenario is valuable.
	702.	My understanding of perioperative care was improved by the virtual patient scenario.
	704.	The written case study assignment is valuable.
	705.	The use of FACS to teach pre-operative assessment is valuable.
	711.	I learnt most from the clinical attachments.
	712.	I learnt most from the tutorials and workshops.
	713.	I learnt most from the Elearning resources.
	714.	I learnt most from the self study periods.
	809.	Acute pain management teaching is a valuable part of the course.
	815.	The topics covered are appropriate and useful.
	816.	The clinical skills to be acquired are valuable.
	817.	Facilities to practice clinical skills at the Prince of Wales Hospital were sufficient.
	818.	Facilities to practice clinical skills at the Tai Po Nethersole Hospital were sufficient.
	819.	The topic covered are appropriate and useful.
	820.	The bedside rounds are valuable.
	828.	My understanding of the subject was greatly improved by his/her tutorials/bedside teaching.
	829.	Overall, he/she is an excellent instructor.
	830.	Teaching of resuscitation skills is valuable.
	831.	The Topic Presentation assignments is valuable.
	832.	Exposure to acute pain service is valuable.
	834.	Exposure to obstetrics anaesthesia & analgesia is valuable.
	835.	A & E topics are valuable.
	838.	X-ray tutorials are valuable.
	839.	Medical Ethics lectures are valuable.
	867.	I learnt most about acute pain management from the lecture/tutorial.
	868.	I learnt most about acute pain management from the pain ward round.
	870.	I learnt most about acute pain management from the virtual patient.
	871.	I learnt most about acute pain management from the FACS website.
School of Biomedical Sciences	628.	The quality of teaching materials in practicals was excellent.
	751.	I relied extensively on the textbook(s) to learn the course material.
	768.	The laboratory manual was clearly written and helpful.
	769.	I find the instructor's explanation clear and easy to understand.
	875.	Total hour for the lectures was appropriate.
	876.	Lectures were easy to follow.
	877.	Balance between basic and applied/clinical information was appropriate.
	878.	Revision lectures were useful.
	879.	Total hour for the practicals was appropriate.
	880.	Amount of assigned work for the practicals was appropriate.
	881.	Lecturers gave clear explanation in the practicals.
	882.	Teaching assistants gave clear explanation in the practicals.
	883.	Students' presentation of their dissection was useful.
	884.	Live audiovisual demonstrations in the practicals were useful.
	885.	Software/computer graphics for the course were useful.
	886.	Amount of materials covered in lecture was appropriate.
	887.	Lectures were well organized.
	888.	Lectures were well presented.
	889.	Help given in the practicals was useful.
	626.	The instructor(s) presented the course materials clearly.
	629.	The tutorials were helpful in the learning of the subject.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
School of Biomedical Sciences (continued)	630.	The tutorials were interesting and stimulating.
	646.	The laboratory demonstration was a valuable part of this course.
Department of Clinical Oncology	563.	The tutor of Chemo Day Clinic (a.m.) was effective in teaching.
	564.	The tutors of Chemo Follow-up Clinic (Monday p.m.) were effective in teaching.
	565.	The tutor of General Follow-up Clinic (Thursday p.m.) was effective in teaching.
	566.	The tutor of Gynaecology Clinic was effective in teaching.
	567.	The tutor of HOH Hospice Visit was effective in teaching.
	568.	The tutor of Gynaecology Clinic was effective in teaching.
	569.	The tutor of Lymphoma Clinic was effective in teaching.
	570.	The tutors of New Case Clinic (a.m.) were effective in teaching.
	571.	The tutor of RT Treatment Clinic was effective in teaching.
	572.	The tutors of Ward Teaching (Long Case) were effective in teaching.
	573.	The tutors of Ward Teaching (Short Case) were effective in teaching.
	574.	The tutor of Breast Clinic was effective in teaching.
	575.	The tutor of Sarcoma Clinic was effective in teaching.
	576.	The tutors of QEH Visit was effective in teaching.
	577.	The tutors of Bradbury Hospice Visit were effective in teaching.
	578.	The tutor of Leukemia Clinic was effective in teaching.
School of Public Health and Primary Care	95.	Visit to Centre for Health Protection was good.
	96.	Visit to Food and Environmental Hygiene Department was good.
	97.	Community Health Visit was good.
	98.	Factory Visit was good.
	99.	Occupational Health Clinical Attachment was good.
	349.	The supervisor provided sufficient supervision and feedback toward various aspects of my project.
	350.	The supervisor provided supportive idea toward various aspects of my project.
	351.	The supervisor was available for meetings.
	391.	The content is relevant to the ageing process, the health and social issues of elderly in Hong Kong.
	521.	The tutor provided a good insight into the subject of Community Medicine.
	522.	I deepened my interest in the subject matter.
	523.	I gained a good understanding of the relevant concepts/principles.
	524.	The objectives were clearly defined.
	525.	The amount of material covered was reasonable.
	526.	The level of difficulty was appropriate.
	527.	The teacher was able to convey the relevant information effectively.
	528.	The lessons learned are applicable to clinical practice.
	2528.	The lessons learned are relevant to clinical practice.
	529.	The method of teaching was ideal for learning this subject matter.
	530.	The teaching was well organized.
	531.	The problem based learning format was effective for learning.
	532.	Community health project enabled me to understand principles & methods in epidemiology.
	533.	Community health project enabled me to understand published research findings.
	534.	Community health project enabled me to acquire skills in conducting epidemiological study.
	535.	Epidemiology exercises helped me understand application of epid. to public health problems.
	536.	Factory visit enabled me to understand health problems in the workplace.
	537.	Community medicine seminars deepened my understanding of public health.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
School of Public Health and Primary Care (continued)	538.	Lectures in community medicine were comprehensive & valuable.
	539.	Community medicine notes & handouts were helpful for learning.
	540.	Clinical attachments were useful in improving my patient management skills.
	541.	Clinical attachments gave me adequate exposure to problems encountered in general practice.
	542.	Clin. attachments gave me better understanding of the role of general/family practitioners.
	543.	Video session revealed my strengths & weaknesses in diagnosis & problem solving.
	544.	Video session revealed my strengths & weaknesses in verbal & non-verbal communication.
	545.	Consulting skills sessions were useful in improving my consulting & communication skills.
	546.	Community nursing visits gave good insight into the home care of patients & their family.
	547.	Lectures in family medicine were comprehensive & valuable.
	548.	Small group tutorials in family medicine allowed useful discussion & interaction.
	549.	Family medicine notes & handouts were helpful for learning.
	550.	OSCE was a good test of my clinical knowledge & skills.
	551.	OSCE was a fair & objective test.
	552.	Self-directed learning packages were comprehensive & valuable.
	553.	Computer & audiovisual facilities were helpful for community health project & self-study.
	554.	The undergraduate resource library provided adequate reference material.
	555.	The Departmental library has a good collection of books & journals for reference.
	556.	The recommended texts for community medicine were good reference sources.
	557.	The recommended texts for family medicine were good reference sources.
	558.	The lessons learned are applicable to epidemiology practice.
	559.	The topic was useful.
	560.	I gained a good understanding of the topic.
	561.	The lecturer's presentation of the topic was good.
	562.	The objectives were achieved.
	657.	Lecture by Food and Environmental Hygiene Department was good.
	670.	Community Health Visits were good.
	681.	The content is relevant to the further understanding of end-of-life care in this regard.
	701.	The objectives of each session were clearly defined.
	703.	The size of the group was appropriate to achieve the objectives.
	706.	I found it useful to play the roles.
	707.	The role playing by other students was helpful.
	710.	The handouts were relevant and helpful.
	717.	Audio/video records of lectures are useful resources, I wish to have more of them available.
	731.	I gained a good understanding of principles and concepts (first contact, comprehensive, patient centred, coordinated and continuity of care) of good family practice in this attachment.
	732.	I gained a good understanding of the role of preventive care in the primary care settings in this attachment.
	733.	I learned to provide patient education and counseling in this attachment.
	734.	I developed clinical problem solving skills in the management of common diseases in primary care.
	735.	I deepened my interest in family medicine after this attachment.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
School of Public Health and Primary Care (continued)	737.	The number of patients seen and the variety of clinical problems presented in this practice is reasonable.
	746.	The tutor(s) provided a good insight into the subject of Family Medicine.
	748.	The case based learning format was effective for learning.
	755.	I gained a good understanding of the role of community care services in the overall organization of primary care services.
	756.	I gained a good understanding of the importance of multidisciplinary team work in the provision of primary care.
	757.	I deepened my interest in primary and community care after this attachment.
	758.	The number of sessions attended is reasonable.
	760.	Overall, I am satisfied with these community attachments.
	761.	I gained a good understanding of the role of preventive care in this attachment.
	766.	I deepened my interest in this specialty after this attachment.
	767.	I gained a good understanding of principles and concepts (first contact, comprehensive, patient centred, coordinated and continuity of care) in this attachment.
	805.	I have a proper understanding of the lectures.
	806.	The objectives of the subject were achieved.
	808.	I have gained useful knowledge on this subject.
	811.	The lecture is well presented.
	814.	Community health visits & evaluations deepened my understanding of public health.
	873.	I learned how to communicate with health care professionals.
Department of Medicine	42.	The attachment gave good clinical experience.
	518.	The attachment was well organized.
	519.	The attachment was interactive.
	625.	It is helpful to consolidate our knowledge and skill for care of in-patients.
	679.	The instructor was good at bedside teaching.
	680.	The instructor was helpful in outpatient clinics.
	770.	I can benefit from the teaching of clinical skill.
	771.	I can benefit from the teaching of clinical management.
	789.	The tutors are active and helpful in clinical teaching.
	790.	The attachment was useful overall.
	791.	The range of cases seen was good and helpful.
	846.	I was adequately taught clinical skills in this course.
The Nethersole School of Nursing	492.	The assessment method(s) was/were appropriate.
	493.	The teacher was helpful in answering questions.
	736.	The instructor was responsive to questions and comments.
	738.	Overall, the instructor had a good relationship with students in the clinical setting.
Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology	90.	The revision tutorials were helpful.
	280.	The amount of tutorials is appropriate.
	281.	The Friday lunch-time tutorials were helpful.
	302.	The Evidence Based Medicine tutorial was a good learning experience.
	512.	I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this tutorial.
	516.	The objectives of the tutorial were clearly defined.
	689.	The module was a good learning experience.
	690.	The first week programme was a good introduction to the module.
	691.	The PWH labour ward (6E) rotation was a good learning experience.
	692.	The PWH gynaecology rotation was a good learning experience.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology (continued)	693.	The PWH obstetrics rotation was a good learning experience. For the next 3 questions, please rate whichever applies to you:
	694.	The CMC rotation was a good learning experience.
	695.	The PMH rotation was a good learning experience.
	696.	The TMH rotation was a good learning experience.
	697.	We do not get enough lectures.
	698.	We do not get enough contact with patients.
	700.	We do not get enough teaching from doctors.
	709.	We get very good teaching from nurses and midwives.
Department of Orthopaedics & Traumatology	504.	The use of clinical materials (clinical picture, case, patients, specimen) was appropriate.
	505.	The teaching venue was suitable.
	506.	The teaching facilities (lighting, seats, space) were adequate.
	507.	The total number of teaching sessions was appropriate.
	508.	The application of orthopaedic knowledge to real life clinical conditions was taught.
	509.	The application of basic clinical skills was illustrated and emphasized.
	597.	The topical tutorial was useful.
	598.	The bedside teaching was useful.
	599.	The OT sessions were useful.
	601.	The X-ray meetings were useful.
	605.	The outpatient clinic was useful.
	606.	The ward attachment was useful.
	609.	The evening rounds were useful.
	610.	The ward rounds were useful.
	611.	The presentation drilling was useful.
	612.	The clinical conference was useful.
	613.	The handouts were helpful in learning and revision.
	614.	Which of the following teams had the best educational activity in PWH? (Please use 1=Team A, 2=Team B, 3=Paediatric, 4=Hand, 5=Rehab)
	615.	Which of the following activities was the most worthwhile? (Please use 1=ward round, 2=Grand Round, 3=OT, 4=OPD, 5=Conference)
	620.	Teaching in PWH as compared with other teaching units was good.
	621.	Location of the hospital was suitable.
	622.	The venue of the hospital was suitable.
	623.	Facilities of the hospital were adequate.
	624.	The use of A/V equipment at the hospital was adequate.
	627.	The duration of teaching sessions at the hospital was appropriate.
	631.	Teaching was adequate.
	632.	The quality of teaching (topic & level) was good.
	633.	Attitude of doctors towards teaching was good.
	634.	The instructor's teaching skill was good.
	635.	The application of basic physical examination skills was illustrated and emphasized.
	636.	The emergency admission round was useful.
	641.	I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this session.
	642.	The session was well organized.
	644.	The objectives of the session were clearly defined.
	645.	The amount of material covered in the session was reasonable.
	647.	The level of difficulty of the session material was appropriate.
	800.	The Curriculum Book made a valuable contribution to the course.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Department of Paediatrics	83.	Having a mentor was good.
	84.	Overall, I am satisfied with my mentor.
	85.	The Evening Presentation Ward Rounds were good.
	135.	The clinical module lectures were good.
	141.	The time allocated to the clinical module lectures was appropriate.
	143.	The clinical skills assessments were good.
	219.	Overall, I am satisfied with the Paediatric SSM.
	231.	The Medical Officer Bed-side and tutorial teaching was good.
	235.	The Evening Teaching Ward Rounds were good.
	238.	The Saturday morning tutorial teaching was good.
	239.	The time allocated to the Bed-side and tutorial teaching was appropriate.
	469.	The "Peer Assessor" clinical skills assessment was useful.
	470.	The "Junior Assessor" clinical skills assessment was good.
	471.	The "Senior Assessor" clinical skills assessment was good.
	472.	The Team Head Bed-side teaching was good.
School of Pharmacy	93.	I gained a good understanding on drug knowledge application from case studies.
	94.	I gained valuable clinical knowledge from case illustration seminars.
	104.	I gained valuable clinical knowledge from ward rounds.
	307.	The pharmacy service seminars deepen my interest in pharmaceutical care practice.
	309.	I gained new insights on drug therapy through chart reviews.
	310.	I developed the ability to think critically through case assignments.
	311.	I developed the ability to solve problems in real patients through case assignments.
	312.	The case assignments motivate my self-directed learning.
	313.	Peer assessment activities improve my ability to acknowledge the strengths of others.
	327.	I gained further insights on drug therapy from case presentation workshop.
	321.	Peer assessment activities improve my ability to provide constructive feedbacks.
	323.	I developed the ability to communicate effectively through case presentation workshops.
	327.	I gained further insights on drug therapy from case presentation workshop.
	343.	The teacher presented materials that deepen my drug therapy knowledge.
	346.	The teacher discussed case studies that enhance my ability to apply drug knowledge.
	365.	The practicals were challenging and worthwhile.
	405.	The project provides opportunities to gain practical experience in pharmaceutical care.
	406.	The supervisor stimulated me to formulate strategies to solve problems encountered.
	407.	The supervisor is knowledgeable and provides direction for project development when needed.
	418.	The case study sessions were well organized.
	419.	The case study questions were relevant to clinical medicine.
	443.	There was good interaction between lecturers and students in case study sessions.
	445.	The basic pharmacology teaching was helpful in interpreting the case studies.
	446.	The Therapeutics teaching and case studies were helpful in applying the pharmacology knowledge.
	447.	I was able to understand the significance of the clinical test data.
	494.	The tutorial questions were relevant to clinical pharmacy.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
School of Pharmacy (continued)	495.	The case study questions were relevant to clinical pharmacy.
	579.	The unit was interesting/stimulating.
	448.	I understood how to design treatment plans for therapeutic management.
	580.	The course material was relevant to Pharmacy.
	581.	The balance of presentation was appropriate (e.g. lectures, tutorials, practicals).
	582.	An appropriate amount of direction was given for study (e.g. lectures, tutorials, practicals).
	583.	Basic principles of subjects were emphasized and not solely a collection of facts.
	584.	Lecture topic was put into its proper context and was related to Pharmacy and other relevant areas of the course.
	585.	Lecturer explained subject clearly and answered questions carefully and precisely.
	586.	Lecturer was well prepared.
	587.	Lecturer stated objectives of each lecture and related lecture material to the preceding lecture in the sequence.
	588.	Lecturer clearly identified the points in lecture which he/she considers to be most important.
	589.	Lecturer was enthusiastic about his/her subject.
	590.	Lecturer had a genuine interest in students.
	591.	Lecturer was approachable outside the lecture period.
	592.	Lecturer could detect when students were confused and was prepared to go over points again.
	593.	Lecturer's style of presentation was interesting and held attention.
	594.	The course was interesting/stimulating.
	595.	The course material was relevant to my future practice as a pharmacist.
	596.	Handouts and lecture notes are useful.
	730.	The teleconferencing arrangement help to achieve the same learning as other lecture.
	874.	I gained valuable drug therapy knowledge from lectures.
	897.	The supervisor of my project provided sufficient guidance toward various aspects of my Project.
	898.	The final report and presentation of the results of the project is a good way of evaluating the project.
	7001.	The journal club strengthened my literature evaluation skills.
	7002.	The literature evaluation skills learnt are important to my practice as clinical pharmacist.
	7003.	The drug information skills learnt are important to my practice as a clinical pharmacist.
Organization	602.	The lecture component of the course was well organized.
	603.	The laboratory component of the course was well organized.
	604.	The lecture and lab components of the course were well synchronized.
	607.	The emphasis of the course should be more theoretical (less practical).
	608.	The material in this course is relevant to my needs.
	618.	The pace of the lectures was too fast.
	619.	The topics covered in lectures were relevant to the course objectives.
	819.	The topic covered are appropriate and useful.
	866.	The course content was appropriate.
		(For the next questions, use 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 =Excellent)
Rapport	847.	The course coordinator was available to deal with problems related to this course.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR DEPARTMENT / PANEL**

Attribute	ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Laboratory Instructor	650. 651. 653. 654. 655.	The laboratory instructor was well prepared for labs. The laboratory instructor explained concepts clearly. The laboratory instructor was enthusiastic. The laboratory instructor was responsive to students' questions. Overall, the laboratory instructor was effective.
Laboratory Assignments Genetics related	656. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778.	The laboratory was a useful supplement to the materials covered in the lectures. The laboratory instructor was well organized. The laboratory instructor was helpful. The laboratory instructor made the labs sufficiently challenging. The lab grading system was explained clearly by the laboratory instructor. I learned a lot in the labs from the laboratory instructor. The information on the exercises in the lab manual was helpful. The weekly schedule of lab exercises correlated well with lecture discussions. The written analysis for each lab exercise was intellectually challenging. The quizzes were a fair means of assessment of the understanding of concepts.
Surgery	897. 898. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 678. 683. 686. 687. 688. 689. 717. 718. 719. 720. 749. 759. 762. 763. 764. 765. 779. 788.	The workload was appropriate. The teaching material was useful. I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this module. The module was well organized. The objectives of the module were clearly defined. The amount of material covered in the module was appropriate. The level of difficulty of the module material was appropriate. I desire to pursue this field further. I am able to identify and analyze problems in this field. I am able to discuss subject matter in this field critically and competently. The tutorials were useful. The instructor(s) had adequate knowledge of the subject. The module was a good learning experience. The instructor gave clear instructions. The telecast teaching session was useful. The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the clinic subject. The instructor was sensitive to student difficulties encountered during clinics. The instructor was clear in presentation. The variety and quality of illustrative examples were satisfactory. The instructor(s) was/were able to arouse students' interests in subject matter. The instructor(s) respected students' opinion and concerns. The instructor(s) had enthusiasm and sense of responsibility in teaching. The instructor(s) was/were open to criticism. I gained the ability to take a history and physical examination on surgical patients. I am satisfied with the overall performance of the instructor(s).
Medical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases related	795. 801. 802. 803. 845.	The laboratories were well organized. The content was difficult. The content was appropriate. The teaching method and delivery was good. The Infectious Disease Teachings in Shadow Intern Attachment were useful.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS OR PANELS**

ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
Cardiovascular-Respiratory (PCAR)	450. The teacher(s) was/were well prepared. 451. The teacher(s) gave clear explanations.
Clinical Methods (PCLM)	77. The time allocated to the topics was appropriate. 66. I am satisfied with my learning experience. 456. The topics covered are useful. 457. The time allocated to the topics was appropriate. 486. I like the current format of integrated teaching. 487. The teaching helped me understand the relevance of structures and functions and the inter-dependency of the bodily systems. 488. The teaching helped me understand the nature of medical profession and the health care organization. 489. I learned the basic management of cardiac arrest victims. 490. I learned the basic management of choking victims. 491. I learned to define and solve these victims' problems. 496. I like the current format of integrated teaching. 497. The teaching helped me understand the relevance of structures and functions and the inter-dependency of the bodily systems. 498. The teaching helped me understand the nature of medical profession and the health care organization. 499. The topics covered are useful.
Communication Skills (COSK)	394. The Workshop deepened my interest in the subject matter. 395. I gained a better understanding of the concepts/principles in this topic. 396. I gained a better understanding of myself through this Workshop. 397. The exercises and discussion were stimulating. 398. The handouts were useful. 399. The objectives of the Workshop were achieved. 416. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the facilitators. 417. Overall, I am satisfied with the Workshop.
Foundation Studies (PFOS)	453. The tutorials were helpful in the learning of the subject.
Gastroenterology & Nutrition (PGIN)	2451. The teacher gave clear explanations. 452. The teacher was helpful. 476. The tutorial/practical was well organized. 484. The practical/demonstration were a valuable part of this course. 485. The practical/demonstration were well organized.
Neuroscience (PNEU)	841. The Clinical Studies were helpful in our learning of the subject. 842. The Problem-based Learning sessions were helpful in our learning of the subject.

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ENTERED
BY
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

ACCESS Item Number	Item Content
<p>If any open-ended questions are selected from the following list or supplied as unique questions, they will appear on the questionnaire following the instruction: Please use the back of this sheet to respond to the following.</p>	<p>902. Which aspects of the course did you like the best?</p>
	<p>903. Which aspects of the course did you like least?</p>
<p>If no open-ended questions appear on the questionnaire, the following instruction will be supplied automatically: If you have any additional comments, use the back of this sheet.</p>	<p>904. What changes would you make in the lectures?</p>
	<p>905. What changes would you make in the readings?</p>
	<p>908. Which aspects of the course were most valuable?</p>
	<p>909. Which aspects of the course were least valuable?</p>
	<p>911. Comment on general course quality. How could the course be improved?</p>
	<p>915. Which was the best aspect of the course?</p>
	<p>916. Which aspect was the most in need of improvement?</p>
	<p>917. What techniques might this instructor use to help you learn better?</p>
	<p>919. If you have indicated strong opinions in the above questions, either positive or negative, please identify areas or persons if you so wish.</p>
	<p>920. What have you found most helpful about the course?</p>
	<p>921. What have you found least helpful about the course?</p>
	<p>972. Comment about improvements that could be made to this course (and why).</p>
	<p>973. Please add additional comments, if any.</p>
	<p>978. Give your written comments on any aspect of the course and/or the instructor.</p>
	<p>983. Please provide feedback to help improve the course objectives and the course materials.</p>
	<p>986. What did you like BEST about his course (and why)?</p>
	<p>987. What did you like LEAST about this course (and why)?</p>
	<p>994. Comment on the group learning experience. How could sessions be improved?</p>
	<p>999. Comment on the overlap between this course and other courses.</p>

Appendix B

Examples of Block-ids that generate administrative reports:

(i.e., block-ids which begin with 1, 2, or 3)

Id	Included Questions	Report Recipient
<i>1FA2</i>	101 120 270 276 292 296	Faculty of Medicine
<i>2FA2</i>	101 120 270 276 292 296 812 813	Faculty of Medicine
<i>2CF2</i>	101 120 270 276 292 296 275 340 344	Community & Family Medicine
<i>2CO1</i>	292 200 101	Clinical Oncology