

Evaluation of the performance of a post graduate orientation workshop by the participants – a questionnaire based study

Nagapati Prabhakar Bhat^{1*}, Madhav K. Savkar²

¹Assistant Professor, ²Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Adichunchanagiri Institute of Medical Sciences, B. G. Nagara, 571448 Karnataka, INDIA.

Email: npbhat17@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction: Performance evaluation of any learning-teaching activity by the participants is routine exercise at most of the international institutions for higher education. Some speakers prefer to evaluate their own skills by giving pre-designed set of questions to the prospective participants for their own record and further improvement. Here, we have tried to evaluate the performance of a workshop as conceived by the participants. The reasons for doing so were many folds. Firstly, there were no incentives, gifts, credit hours (points) and a certificate of participation. Secondly, during the planning of workshop, doubts were expressed by some of the college authorities as regard to success of workshop. All these prompted us to seek first hand information from the participants regarding their views on topic, speakers and overall assessment. **Materials and Methods:** This was a questionnaire based evaluation. All of us under the guidance of medical education unit prepared a set of questions to evaluate workshop performance in respect of the topic, the speakers and overall assessment of entire activity. Each question had five options ranging from strongly agreed to strongly disagree. Result was expressed in term of percentage response in agree, neutral or disagree category. **Results:** The response of participants towards workshop was unexpectedly overwhelming. Almost, 80-85% of participants liked the topic. All the speakers were highly appreciated for their presentation and knowledge. Nearly 85-90% of the participants opined favourably to overall success of the workshop. **Conclusions:** From the results, it can be concluded that there was overwhelming response from the participants to this workshop. More such workshops should be conducted every year without fear of failure.

Keywords: Feedback Questionnaire, Evaluation of a workshop activity, Faculty performance evaluation, Assessment of workshop.

*Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Nagapati Prabhakar Bhat, Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Adichunchanagiri Institute of Medical Sciences, B. G. Nagara, 571448 Karnataka, INDIA.

Email: npbhat17@gmail.com

Received Date: 10/02/2015 Revised Date: 26/12/2015 Accepted Date: 18/10/2016

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code:	Website: www.medpulse.in
	DOI: ---

INTRODUCTION

Medical Education Unit, Adichunchanagiri Institute Of Medical Sciences, B.G.Nagara, organized a workshop titled " post graduate orientation programme" on 7th and

8th of august 2013 at pathology lecture hall. There were many topics related to postgraduate synopsis, dissertation work, seminars, journal club etc. All the topics were presented by our own college faculties. On day-1, we had eight sessions and on day-2, we had four sessions. Each session was around 30 min or 1hour depending on the topic. The detailed workshop programme schedule is enclosed in appendix 1. As we already know that getting a medical postgraduate seat (MD/MS/DIPLOMA) is a challenging task. It requires a lot of commitment and hard work. Postgraduate aspirants have to undergo various entrance examinations for which financial support and moral support from the family is required. So, it is understood that when freshers' join the course, his/her mind has already tackled a lot of stress at the same time

he/she is delighted for getting the seat of their choice in a recognized institute. It is certain that most of the freshers would have attended their last medical lectures at least one and half years back (the period may extend up to 3-4 years or more). So, we were very keen to evaluate their performance in the orientation workshop. The other reasons were, there were no incentives, gifts, credit hours (points), certificate of participation and during the planning of workshop, doubts were expressed by some of the college authorities as regard to success of workshop. All these prompted us to seek first hand information from the participants regarding their views on topic, speakers and overall assessment.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A questionnaire is said to be standardized when each respondent is to be exposed to the same questions and the same system of coding responses. The aim here is to try to ensure that differences in responses to questions can be interpreted as reflecting differences among respondents, rather than differences in the processes that produced the answers^{1,2,3}. Standardized questionnaires are often used in the field of educational planning to collect information about various aspects of school systems. The main way of collecting this information is by asking people questions – either through oral interviews (face to face or telephone), or by self-administered questionnaires, or by using some combination of these two methods^{4,5,6}. Although survey research, by definition, implies the use of some form of questionnaire to be administered to a sample of respondents, the questionnaire is simply one instrument that can be employed in the study of a research problem. As such, it may or may not be the most

suitable tool for the task at hand^{7,8,9}. We followed standard pattern for evaluation of teaching performance used most commonly¹⁰. We took the initiative in this regard. We prepared a set of questions under the guidance of faculty for the workshop. The questions were framed to evaluate workshop mainly from three perspectives: 1. “The topic” 2. “The speakers” 3. “Overall assessment” Each question was assigned five options viz. strongly agreed, agreed, neutral, disagreed and strongly disagreed¹¹. The participants were asked to select one option which is most appropriate to relevant question according to them. The questionnaire was distributed among the participants after the end of the workshop on day-2. Disclosing the name of the responder was made mandatory to ascertain credibility of data thus obtained^{12,13}. The response was reviewed and analysis was done.

Analysis

For the sake of convenience, the five options for each question was resolved in to three categories viz. {strongly agreed, agreed} {neutral} {disagreed, strongly disagreed}. The results were expressed as percentage response in each of three categories from the total as 100%.

RESULTS

There were a total of 65 registrations for the workshop. Majority of the participants were present at the start of the workshop but some had to leave in between to attend their hospital duties. In all, we received 50 completed feedback forms from the participants which were then analysed and the result is presented below in the tabular form (Table-1).

Table 1: Percentage response of participants to Feedback Questions in each category

Q.No	Questions	Response (%), n= 50 (100%)		
		Strongly agreed/agreed	Neutral	Strongly disagreed/ disagreed
About The Topic				
1	I was made aware about the aims and objectives of the workshop	92	8	0
2	The sequence of presentation helped me to understand the subject	84	14	2
3	The academic contents of lectures was stimulating	78	22	0
4	The topic generated a great deal of enthusiasm	62	34	4
5	The entire activity was well organised	94	4	2

Table 2: About The Speakers

Q.No	Questions	Response (%), n= 50 (100%)		
		Strongly agreed/agreed	Neutral	Strongly disagreed/ disagreed
1	The presenter seems to have good knowledge about the subject	98	2	0
2	The subject material was free of jargon(useless stuff) and	74	22	4

	presented at right pace			
3	The speakers explained the subject clearly	88	12	0
4	The speakers encouraged questioning from the participants and answered these satisfactorily	60	28	12
5	Speakers created enthusiasm and interest among the participants	66	28	6

Table 3: Overall Assessment Of The Workshop

Q.No	Questions	Response (%), n= 50 (100%) Q.No		
		Strongly agreed/agreed	Neutral	Strongly disagreed/ disagreed
1	Ppt slides were clear and tangible	94	4	2
2	The workshop was appropriate for target audience	82	12	6
3	The presentations were lively and energetic, has positive impact on my thought process	74	24	2
4	It improved my ability to utilise skills related to topic	86	12	2
5	Overall activity was enriching and I would like to recommend such programme to others	90	8	2

Appendix 1: Detailed Workshop Programme

Table 4: Day-1: Wednesday: 7-08-2013

Time	Topics	Speakers
9.00- 10.00	Introduction To PG Curriculum	Dr. Vijayshankar
10.00- 10.45am	Research Question, Research Title, Introduction And Background, Aims and Objectives	Dr. Sudhir
10.45- 11.15am	Review Of Literature	Dr. Suresh Lankeshwar
	11.15- 11.30am TEA BREAK	
11.30- 12.00pm	Study Designs	Dr. Asha rani
12.00- 12.30pm	Sampling Techniques	Dr. Srinivas
12.30- 1.00pm	Materials And Methods	Dr. Suresh Lankeshwar
	1.00- 2.00pm LUNCH BREAK	
2.00- 3.00pm	Types Of Data, Methods Of Collection Of Data, Data Coding And Data Entry Using Microsoft Excel	Dr. Asif khan
3.00- 4.00pm	Reference Writing	Dr. Vijayshankar
	4.00-4.30pm HIGH TEA	

Table 5: Day-2: Thursday: 08-08-2013

Time	Topics	Speakers
9.00- 10.00am	Pedagogy	Dr.M.C.Raghupathi
10.00-11.00am	Subject Seminar	Dr. Aliya
	11.00- 11.15am TEA BREAK	
11.15- 12.15pm	Journal Club	Dr. Radha
12.15- 1.15pm	Medical Ethics	Dr. Srinivas
	1.15- 2.00pm LUNCH BREAK	

DISCUSSION

Performance evaluation of any learning-teaching activity is always desirable but seldom done¹⁴. From among many workshops held at our institute, to our knowledge, none was evaluated from the participants' point of view.

The unique features about this workshop were

1. Exclusively for post graduates who got admitted freshly in the present academic year 2013-14.
2. No credit points or credit hours

3. No registration fee, no gifts to participants, no certificate of participation
4. No mementos for faculty.

The above features indicate that participants attended the workshop out of their interest and enthusiasm in the subject rather than any other non-academic incentives.

From the results it is amply clear that participants wholeheartedly supported the workshop. Regarding the topic, the response in favour of it ranged from 80 to 85%.

About the speakers, the favourable response ranged from 70 to 75% and workshop overall success was rated 85 to 90%. The overwhelming response from the participants which includes both the genders from various departments of our college but one common characteristic that all of them belong to first year, got admitted in the same academic year 2013-14, indicates that workshop was unanimously accepted and appreciated by all.

CONCLUSIONS

From the results, it can be concluded that there was overwhelming response from the participants to this workshop activity. More such workshops may be planned in future without fear of failure.

REFERENCES

1. Kenneth N.Ross, Maria Teresa Siniscalco and Nadia Auriat. Quantitative research methods in educational planning. Questionnaire design Module 8. International Institute for Educational Planning © UNESCO. September 2005; page 3-4.
2. Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement. London: Pinter Publishers Limited. 1992
3. Payne, S.L. The art of asking questions. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 1951
4. Sheatsley, P.B, P.H. Rossi, J.D. Wright, A.B. Anderson. Questionnaire construction and item writing. Handbook of survey research. New York: Academic Press. 1983.

5. Converse J.M, Presser. S. Survey questions: handcrafting the standardized questionnaire. California: Beverly Hills, Sage. 1986.
6. Foddy W. Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1993
7. Johnstone, J.N, J.P. Keeves. Educational research, methodology and measurement: an international handbook. New York: Pergamon Press, 1988, pp. 451-456.
8. Abbat ER. Teaching for better learning. A guide for teachers of primary health care staff. 2nd Edn. Geneva, WHO, 1992.
9. Guilbert JJ. Educational handbook for health personnel. 6th Edn. Geneva, WHO, 1998.
10. Evaluation of lecturer teaching performance, UNE, The University of New England; 2006, SAMP 101.
11. Medical education: principles and practice. National Teacher Training Centre, JIPMER, Pondicherry, 1997.
12. Knight AB. Lectures: Organizing Them and Making Them Interesting. University of Oklahoma Instructional Development Program, 2006.
13. David Newble, Robert Cannon, Fria. A handbook for the medical teachers, 2nd Edn. MTP Press Limited.
14. Wass V, Bowden, Jackson N. The principles of assessment design. In editors Jackson N, Jamieson A, Khan A. Assessment in Medical education and Training. A practical guide. Radcliff Publishing Oxford, pages 11-26

Source of Support: None Declared
Conflict of Interest: None Declared