

based Web How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Dr Hervé Platteaux Centre NTE, University of Fribourg

herve.platteaux@unifr.ch

Lucerne, 26.05.2003



A peece

N SSSS

00

bas

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Project collaboration

- Institutes of 3 Swiss Universities are collaborating within the SVC Embryology project:
 - University of Fribourg (Project leader):
 - Institute of Histology and General Embryology
 - Centre NTE
 - University of Bern
 - Institute of Anatomy
 - University of Lausanne
 - Institute of Cell Biology and Morphology

The project team members are:

- in Fribourg: Prof. M. Celio (Project Leader), Dr M. Adé-Damilano (Project Coordinator), Dr F. Schöni-Affolter, B. Brüsch, Dr G. Collaud, Dr H. Platteaux, Dr J.-F. Perret
- in Bern: Prof. P. Bürri, Prof. O. Müller, Dr E. Strauch
- in Lausanne: Prof. J.-P. Hornung, PD Dr S. Kasas, Dr C. Dubuis-Grieder









Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case o the SVC WBT embryology course

Project aims

A percent

N SSSS

0

09

- The Embryology project aims at creating and implementing:
 - an interactive 52 hour web-based course in embryology
 - for first and second year medical students
- The course consists of:
 - 10 modules of embryogenesis (for 1st year students)
 - 16 modules of organogenesis (for 2nd year students)
 - different interactive tools (quizz, animations, etc.) to support a better autonomous learning process of the students
- The course development is helped by:
 - all the team members
 - a formative evaluation process
- Why don't you have a look?
 - Site demo: SVC Days 27.05.2003 12:30-13:00



A peece

N SSSS

12 510555

09

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Purposes of the study

- A continuous formative evaluation process applied during the WBT courseware to help its development
 - \rightarrow to feed the project with the students inputs
- Students' inputs to measure their course acceptance
 - Situation 1: 01.2002 course / 53 students answered
 - Situation 2: 11.2002 course / 100 students answered
 - The results of situation 1 define the improvements to be done
 The results of situation 2 control the improvements done



A percent

N SSSS

d)

3

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case o the SVC WBT embryology course

Students' inputs about (1)

- The analysis done with the students
 - measures how much they accept / refuse the course situation
 - gives indications why they feel like this
- A questionnaire at the beginning of the course...
 - students' general use of a computer (activity types, time)
 - students' general use of e-mail and internet (week frequency)
 - students' general judgement about
 - Internet and web are very useful: in general / in course
 - Multimedia opens new perpectives: in general / in course
 - Email is a good communication tool: in general / in course
 - ... to know about
 - familiarity of the students with the computer
 - general use done with the computer
 - global positive / negative attitude and thought of students relative to the use of the computer in courses



A peece

N SSSS

d)

30

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Students' inputs about (2)

- A questionnaire at the end of the course...
 - installation difficulty
 - most appreciated / disliked element (web tool, chapter)
 - communication appreciation with teacher / other students (quantity and moments /used means: F2F or web-based)
 - definition of course objectives (clarity / used means)
 - course objectives mastering
 - used printed copies or on-line documents
 - learning efficiency of resources (theory modules, quiz, case study, communication tools)
 - weekly working time (quantity chapter / feeling)
 - in favour of another virtual course?
- ... to know about
 - utility and usability of web and F2F course resources
 - facility / difficulty of working conditions: objectives, schedule, tasks to be done, quantity of work, etc.



A peece

N SSSS

00

03

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Method of answers' analysis

- Global analysis
 - the answers of all the January students
 - the answers of all the November students
- Global comparison between January and November

- Two categories into November students
 - students who answered « Yes » to the final question
 - students who answered « No » to the final question
- ➔ Looking for the reasons of the students' acceptance
 - depending on e-learning factors?
 - depending on e-learning factors?
 - depending on other factors?



A peece

N SSSS

3

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Results of Student's analysis (1)

Question: What working resources?

	November (all) (% of students)	November (yes) (% of students)	November (no) (% of students)
Read from printed pdf files for about 100% of modules	90	83	97
Read from computer screen for about 100% of modules	12	20	4

- → A large majority of the students need a print to work
- Significant difference between « Yes » and « No » students
- Difficulty to manage two working resources
 - the work on printed paper (note taking, overwriting, etc.)
 - the loss of interactivity (schematics, video, etc.)



A peece

N SSSS

03

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Results of Student's analysis (2)

Question: Do you want more contacts?

	January (% of students)	November (all) (% gf students)	November (yes) (% <u>Qf</u> students)	November (no) (% of students)
More contacts with teacher?				
Yes	38	42	27	57
No	62	56.5	70	43
More contacts with students?				
Yes	25	32	27	37
No	62	67	73	61

No significant difference between January and November

• Students wanting more contact (about 40%): F2F lecture

Significant difference between « Yes » and « No » students

preference for / habit of F2F or distant situations is important



Sec. 1

111

C.....

in the second

70

000

0 0

Web

May 26th Lucerne

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryolog course

Results of Student's analysis (3)

Question: Identification of learning objectives?

	January (% of students)	November (all) (% of students)	November (yes) (% of students)	November (no) (% of students)
Yes	4	45	57	33
Partly	54	50	43	57
No	42	5	0	10

→ Here

Here



Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryolog course

Results of Student's analysis (4)

Question: Means used to identify learning objectives?

10.00 miles	January (% of students)	November (all) (% of students)	November (yes) (% of students)	November (no) (% of students)
Modules	31	65.5	65	66
Teacher	29	14.5	14	15
Other means	26	13.5	12	15
No answer	14	6.5	9	4

Difference between January and November

Here

11

A 10000

N 88685

12 5125555

00

0

0



11

C.....

sed

03

d'

May 26th Lucerne

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Results of Student's analysis (5)

Question: Efficiency of resources for learning?

	January (% of students)	November (all) (% <u>of</u> students)	November (yes) (% of students)	November (no) (% of students)
Modules (theory and quiz)				
Very good and good	51	70	80	60
Sufficient and insufficient	49	22.5	7	38
Modules (quiz alone)				
Very good and good	9	51.5	60	43
Sufficient and insufficient	44	38	30	46
Forum				
Very good and good	23	29.5	33	26
Sufficient and insufficient	32	26.5	10	43
Email				
Very good and good	13	30.5	37	24
Sufficient and insufficient	21	15.5	10	21
Chat		34300x	5,000	-
Very good and good	17	20.5	27	14
Sufficient and insufficient	34	27	23	31



Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Results of Student's analysis (6)

Question: Weekly quantity of work?

	November (yes) (% <u>of</u> students)	November (no) (% <u>of</u> students)
1 hour	7	14
2 hours	47	31
3 hours	43	40
4 hours and more	3	13
<u>average</u> value	2.88 hours	3.06 hours

Difference between January and November

Here

11

A 10000

N SSSS

12 5125555

00

S

0

.0

0

Difference between January and November

Here



Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryology course

Results of Student's analysis (7)

Question: Perception of weekly quantity of work?

	November (yes) (% <u>of</u> students)	November (no) (% gf students)
little and very little	10	10
nomal	53	30
big and very big	33	59

Difference between January and November

Here

11

A 10000

N 88685

12 5105555

70

000

0 0

0



A percent

N SSSS

3

0

Hervé Platteaux

How students perceive elearning situations? The case of the SVC WBT embryolog course

Conclusions and perspectives

Conclusions

- big improvement of the course between January and November
- Perspectives
 - to develop an analysis taking every student individually
 - to measure if there is a correlation between
 - « Yes » or « No » attitudes

and

- communication, work quantity, etc. parameters
- general feeling about computer for teaching (1st Questionnaire)