

MED22IMM (Immunology)
Summary of responses to QAU questionnaire - 2006

Students voluntarily completed a questionnaire during the final week of second semester. The response rate was 73% (30 questionnaires were returned from a class of 41 students).

Questions 1 – 14 were answered with the following numeric responses:

1 = none of the time; 2 = little of the time; 3 = half of the time; 4 = most of the time; 5 = all of the time (so the higher the score, the more positive the response from the students).

The average scores (out of 5) for the responses to these questions were as follows:

Q1:	The aims were made clear	3.3
Q2:	The workload is manageable	3.7
Q3:	The amount and type of assessment is appropriate for this unit.....	3.7
Q4:	The level of support, help and advice is appropriate for this unit	3.6
Q5:	I have learned a lot in this unit	3.8
Q6:	The unit was well organized.....	2.8
Q7:	Things have been explained well in the lectures	3.6
Q8:	You can clearly see how the various parts of the unit fit together	3.5
Q9:	I try to relate ideas in this unit to those in others, whenever possible	3.7
Q10:	Practicals were a useful learning experience	3.1
Q11:	The instructions in the prac manual were clear	2.6
Q12:	The demonstrators helped me to understand the pracs.....	3.2
Q13:	The prescribed textbook was useful	3.1
Q14:	Access to the online lecture material enhanced my understanding of the lecture content	3.5
Q15:	Overall, the quality of the teaching was high	3.7

Question 16 was answered with the following numeric responses:

1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = satisfactory 4 = good 5 = very good
(again, the higher the score, the more positive the response from the students).

The average score (out of 5) for the responses to this question was:

Q16:	All things considered, how would you rate this unit?	3.4
------	--	-----

The overall average score for all 16 questions answered with numeric responses was 3.4 out of 5.

Questions 17 and 18 were open-ended questions about the unit. The most common responses to each of these questions are summarized below, with the % of respondents shown in parentheses. Only those responses given by three or more students (10% or more of respondents) are shown.

Q17:	What is the best thing about this unit?
	The relevance between lectures and pracs (13%)
	The co-ordinator of the practical component of the unit, Peter Cartwright, was very helpful (10%)
	The unit increased my knowledge (10%)
	The pracs were interesting (10%)
	Graham Flannery was interesting (10%)
	The lectures were very interesting (10%)
Q18:	How could this unit be improved?
	Biochem pracs were poorly organized (37%)
	Make the prac manual clearer (13%)
	Biochem pracs were not explained well (10%)
	Should get on-line notes before lectures (10%)
	Lectures were hard to follow (10%)
	Introduce a pre-prac talk (10%)
	Demonstrators should have better knowledge of pracs (10%)

Several new parts of the Biochemistry component of the prac course, which were being trialed for the first time in 2006, will be further refined for 2007. In addition, attempts will be made to improve the clarity of the practical manual. We will also aim to upload teaching materials to WebCT in a more timely fashion.