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Objectives of the project

- develop a standard module evaluation form for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
- develop a standard course evaluation form
- further develop the supporting software to analyse and present web-based summary data
- investigate feasibility of use across campus
Background

- Present mechanism of module evaluation
  - Relies on paper questionnaires
  - Effective

- Problems
  - Time for analysis and production of data
  - Questionable cost-effectiveness
  - Different forms, so not easily compared
QuestMan
Questionnaire Manager

1. Production of computer based forms
2. Students complete the forms
3. Data is emailed to special Questman account
4. Collation in a hierarchical directory structure
5. Responses are made anonymous
6. Production of results for module leaders
   - Web pages of analysis and comments
   - Produces “instant” results, when required
Example web pages

- Menu
- A module evaluation form
- The results
  - Data
  - Summary
  - Comments
  - Data for Excel
Students Evaluation

- To develop the new evaluation form
  - Small focus group with students
  - Pilot of new evaluation form with 1 module

- To compare computer with paper system
  - Web or paper for 5 module evaluations
  - Random allocation for comparison
  - Year 1 and 2
Q1 Prefer paper or web

- Paper: 70%
- Either: 20%
- Web: 10%
Q2. Was form design helpful?

- Yes: 40% (web), 50% (paper)
- Maybe: 20% (web), 30% (paper)
- No: 0% (web), 10% (paper)
Did the medium make a difference?

- Web:
  - Yes: 20%
  - Maybe: 40%
  - No: 60%

- Paper:
  - Yes: 80%
  - Maybe: 100%
Q2.4/3.3 Happy to give username?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of people who are happy to give their username, broken down by web and paper methods. The chart shows a majority of people who are happy to give their username via web, with fewer who are happy to do so via paper.]

- **Yes** (web): 90%
- **Yes** (paper): 60%
- **Maybe** (web): 0%
- **Maybe** (paper): 5%
- **No** (web): 10%
- **No** (paper): 20%
Q2.3 Need a PC lab session? (web users)
Staff Evaluation

- Qualitative information

- Staff preference
  - Preferred new evaluation form
  - 2 staff preferred computer system
  - 3 stated no preference

- Benefits
  - Time
  - Ease of access of results

- Ideas for improvement
Were the evaluation data different from web and paper forms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Computerised Mode</th>
<th>No of students giving a low score, per question</th>
<th>Paper-based Mode</th>
<th>No of students giving a low score, per question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7 (range 0-22)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7 (range 0-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1 (range 0-25)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5 (range 0-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5 (range 0-20)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5 (range 0-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5 (range 0-22)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.7 (range 3-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1 (range 0-14)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7 (range 1-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Were the response rates different for web and paper forms?

Number of students completing the evaluations (n=76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Web (%)</th>
<th>Paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(should have been 38 responses)

Minimum response rate 45% (paper-based)
Maximum response rate 100% (web form)
Further developments

- Standard web form now being used for all physiotherapy modules
  - Years 1, 2 and 3
- Standard course evaluation questionnaire developed and to be piloted end of May 2002
  - Year 3
- Providing summary data to fit with requirements of the annual course reports
Conclusions

- Standard web form
  - acceptable to staff and students
- Summary data - easily interpreted
- Feasible for wide use if
  - Students have access
  - Simple means provided to set up a new questionnaires