

Course Dates: 31st August – 5th September 2015

Overview of evaluation results : Ruth McLaren, Course Facilitator

Eight evaluation forms were completed by course delegates (the ninth delegate had to leave the course early due to family illness).

Question:	Summary of feedback:
1 The best thing about this course was...	Overwhelming support and admiration for the quality of the teaching, the calibre of all the professionals involved in delivering lectures and practical sessions. The dedication and commitment of the team to developing such a comprehensive learning experience was also highlighted.
2 The worst thing about this course was...	The bathroom facilities win the prize for being the worst thing about the course! Most felt there was no “worst thing” about the course itself, with one person commenting that there was not enough time to reflect and re-visit their notes/handouts outside of the sessions.
3 Did any session stand out for you as particularly useful or memorable? If so, which one? And why was this?	The lectures on cell biology, the tumour-specific lectures, the practical lab sessions which put the learning into practice, and the demonstration of the tissue sample preparation.... Basically, the whole course content was mentioned by individuals within the group as a whole.
4 In the afternoons we were mainly in the lab. Please give us your views on the lab sessions.	The majority of delegates thoroughly enjoyed the lab sessions and valued being able to put theory into practice. The sessions were thought to be well structured, informative and delivered with real commitment and enthusiasm from the staff. Only one delegate commented that they found the lab sessions too long, so therefore very tiring and not sure it was a valuable use of time. this person also suggested that one person could “teach and show”, ie: call up delegates to show them each step of the process. However, this would seem contrary to the other delegates who learned from, and valued, being able to do their own “hands-on” processing of the cells, etc.
5 In the mornings we asked 2 students to summarise the previous day. Should we do this again next year?	Six answered “yes”, two “no” and one was “ambivalent”. However, the comments were quite mixed.... Some thought it was a good exercise and helped consolidate their learning, and others felt it added an extra pressure on them or didn’t find the competitive element that the delegates adopted very helpful. One commented that a group discussion in the morning would have been more effective.

	<p><u>RMcL comment:</u> due to the time constraints for the morning sessions, along with comments made by delegates that they had little time for reflection, it may be worth considering a different style for feeding back at future courses. I could sense the pressure each “pair” were under in the evenings if it was their turn to report back in the morning.</p>
<p>6 In future should we replace lab sessions with more lectures or other activities?</p>	<p>A majority “No” vote! Apart from one person who thought they should be shorter and not “hands on”. Again this would not be the view of the other seven delegates who found the lab sessions a welcome balance from the morning sessions which were theoretical.</p>
<p>7 Please give us your views on the catering.</p>	<p>Everyone thought the catering was excellent with one or two suggesting varying the options across the week.... the effort made to provide for one delegate’s dietary issues was highly commended. The option to go out for meals in the evening was welcomed and the course dinner was very well received.</p>
<p>8 Please give us your views on the evening activities.</p>	<p>Overall, everyone seemed to enjoy the evening activities and the effort that had gone into organising them. Some would have valued more “down time” in the evenings for rest and/or reflection of the day’s learning.</p>
<p>9 Overall, the pace of the course was...</p>	<p>Delegates were asked to tick “too fast”, “about right” or “too slow”. The majority felt it was “about right”, with some judging it to be between “too fast” and “about right”.</p>
<p>10 If you stayed at Dawson Hall, please give us your views on the accommodation.</p>	<p>Some found it to be very valuable being on campus but the majority of the comments were about the very poor bathroom facilities, and overall found the accommodation to be very basic.</p>
<p>11 Was it useful for students to stay in the same place overnight?</p>	<p>Overwhelming “Yes” vote.</p>
<p>12 How helpful/unhelpful was it to have time to network with other students on the course?</p>	<p>Everyone found it very helpful and gained a lot from learning about other people’s “cancer journeys” Some felt there wasn’t enough time for networking outwith the course timetable.</p>
<p>13 Should we do anything differently or add any new content if we run this course again next year?</p>	<p>Individual comments from delegates are detailed in the evaluation spreadsheet but generally no-one suggested any major changes for future courses, other than looking at timings and breaks throughout the day, and giving consideration to delivering the course in other parts of the UK.</p>
<p>14 Will you do anything extra or differently as a result of attending this course? If yes, please tell us about this. If not, please say why not.</p>	<p>See individual delegate feedback.... All delegates returned positive responses regarding what they plan to do with their “learning”.</p>
<p>15 Please add any other comments.</p>	<p>Most delegates used this space to express their enormous thanks to the staff, to the ICPV team and Facilitator, or to comment on the facilitation itself.</p>