

**FAKULTI PERUBATAN, UNIVERSITI MALAYA**  
**SOAL-SELIDIK KURIKULUM MBBS-Tutorial PBL**  
**(Fasa II, SESI 2009/2010)**

**UM**  
**Tutor Survey Results**

PBL case 5 – “Azlan” Oct 2009

Purpose of this evaluation is:

1. to obtain **TUTOR’s input** on the PBL Tutorials
2. to improve the PBL Tutorials

**Key: Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 4, Somewhat Agree:3, Disagree: 2, Strongly Disagree:1 (circle the appropriate number)**

No	Statement	5	4	3	2	1	Ave Score
1	The tutor’s guides helped me gauge the content that should be covered by the group	30.00%	50.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00	<b>4.00</b>
2	The students did prepare for the discussion session	35.00%	55.00%	10.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>4.25</b>
3	The dynamic of the group discussion during the tutorials was good	20.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>4.00</b>
4	<b>During the PBL sessions the students have:</b>						
	a. Identified most of the learning objectives expected	15.00%	70.00%	15.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>4.00</b>
	b. Covered the expected core content in their discussion	20.00%	70.00%	10.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>4.10</b>
	c. Exhibited teamwork	20.00%	70.00%	10.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>4.10</b>
5	<b>The PBL tutorials have induced:</b>						
	a. Independent learning	5.00%	65.00%	30.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>3.75</b>
	b. Critical thinking (discriminative reasoning)	10.00%	50.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00	<b>3.60</b>
	c. Integrated learning	10.00%	55.00%	35.00%	0.00	0.00	<b>3.75</b>
6	The students gave feedback on each other at every session	5.00%	25.00%	50.00%	20.00%	0.00	<b>3.15</b>
7	The students gave you feedback on your tutoring role/skill	5.00%	15.00%	55.00%	20.00%	0.00	<b>3.05</b>
		<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>		
8	I have taken the SAME lab group in an earlier PBL case	5.00%			90.00%		

Number of survey forms received = 20

### **TUTORS' COMMENTS**

#### **Which aspects of the PBL tutorial did the group do well?**

1. Information gathering
2. In general, the group did well in all aspects → participation, communication skill, team-building skills, information gathering skill and reasoning respectively
3. Teamwork was good, contribution by everyone with regards to learning objectives & applying knowledge obtained towards the case
4. Sharing information gathered. Team work
5. Gathering of information
6. Participation was good generally and everyone communicated well
7. Cooperative efforts
8. Self discussion & discussion on pathology
9. Identification of learning objectives
10. The learning objectives
11. Knowledge gathering
12. Discussion and interactions between students
13. Discussion during the 2<sup>nd</sup> session
14. One of the students is asthmatic patient. Therefore this related student could demonstrate how to handle when attacked by asthma.
15. The students were cooperative and willing to contribute information
16. Discussion, especially in the brainstorming during S1. Most of them were well prepared for S2. Good to hear some sharing from personal (CFCS or family) experience
17. Team work and cooperation was excellent

#### **Which aspects of the PBL tutorial could the group improve on?**

1. Integration of knowledge & discriminating learning
2. Reasoning skills
3. Some members can be more active
4. Spontaneity
5. Communication
6. More cooperation with each other. Prepare with material reference guide e.g. dictionary in 1<sup>st</sup> semester, critical thinking
7. Comprehension and reasoning skill
8. Pharmacology
9. Not to make diagnosis based on assumption
10. Behavioural and social aspects
11. They need to be able to synthesize the information gathered better – i.e. summarizing the information to become more useful and comprehensible
12. Communication skill
13. They tended to go out of the scope of learning objectives to other learning objectives (jumping from one to the other) and I had to bring them back to the subject for discussion
14. To synthesize their ideas to form some general principles or concept
15. Punctuality

#### **Other Comments**

1. Contents are poorly packed
2. Fairly good group. In 2<sup>nd</sup> semester the quieter ones improved after encouraging them during the 1<sup>st</sup> semester
3. 2<sup>nd</sup> session was carried out better than first session.