

Yerevan State Medical University named after M. Heratsi

Center for Quality Assessment and Assurance

Head of YSMU Quality Assurance Center: A. Hayrapetyan

Faculty Quality Assurance Responsible: Irina Hovhannisyan Date: 27.10.2025

Analysis of the Evaluation of Lectures: Faculty of General Medicine

Purpose of the Research

The goal is to apply the developed questionnaire to evaluate classroom lectures for the various subjects taught within the "General Medicine" faculty, moving beyond single-subject pilot evaluations to a comprehensive faculty-wide assessment⁶.

Methodology

The research was conducted online via a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire included five questions and 15 sub-questions aimed at evaluating different components of the lecture. Focus group discussions were also conducted with students regarding the inquiries included in the questionnaire.

Participants

Students from the "General Medicine" professional educational program participated in the research.

Results

According to the absolute majority of stakeholders, the goal, tasks, and learning outcomes of the lectures across the faculty's curriculum were clearly formulated and had a logical structure.

(Bar Chart 1: Lecture Structure - General Medicine Faculty)

- ▣ Trends indicate high satisfaction with the formulation of goals, tasks, and learning outcomes.

About 70% of students believe that the additional examples presented during lectures and information given in addition to book materials definitely contributed to the easier assimilation of topics.

The methodology of lecture presentation was also assessed quite highly.

Students participating in the research also highly rated such lecture presentation skills of the lecturers as:

- ☐ Clarity of speech.
- ☐ The ability to attract the audience's attention.
- ☐ The ability to fully utilize the lesson time.

Majority of respondents also highlighted usage of modern technical and software tools during lectures

We also consider the students' desire to attend a lecture composed by a given lecturer again as an important indicator of lecture quality assessment. About 90% of students participating in the survey expressed such a desire.

During the completion of the questionnaire, as well as during the discussions held with students afterward, no problems related to the inquiries included in the toolkit or unclear formulations were highlighted by the students.

Conclusion

The results of the research show that students answer the proposed inquiries easily, the inquiries are targeted, and they cover the main components of the lecture.

The evaluation carried out with the aforementioned toolkit shows that the lectures within the "General Medicine" faculty generally had a clear structure, included additional and current examples, and supplemented the information present in the literature given to students. Both traditional and modern tools were used for the delivery of lectures.

Suggestions

1. It is proposed to use the applied questionnaire (Appendix 1) as a standard tool for the periodic evaluation of lectures read within the framework of different modules of the General Medicine curriculum.
2. It is proposed to develop and introduce additional tools for lecture evaluation (peer review, analysis of student progress, etc.).

Appendix 1

Lecture Evaluation

- ☐ Name, Surname of the lecturer: _____
- ☐ Subject: _____ (Field added for multi-subject scope)
- ☐ Student's Course/Year: _____
- ☐ Student's Group: _____

Evaluation Table

Evaluation Scores: 1 is the lowest, 5 is the highest (Mark "V" in the corresponding box).

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Lecture Structure					
a. The goal of the lecture was formulated clearly					
b. The tasks of the lecture were formulated clearly					
c. The learning outcomes of the lecture were formulated clearly					
Lecture Content					
a. The lecture material was narrated in a logical sequence					
b. The lecture contributed to the easy assimilation of the given topic or section					
c. During the lecture, data and/or examples and/or mechanisms were cited that were not presented in the educational literature given to you					
Lecture Methodology					
a. The lecture material was presented simply and clearly					

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
b. The lecture was interactive; modern technical and software means were used during it (Kahoot, Mentimeter, animations, etc.)					
c. Traditional means were used during the lecture (posters, films, pictures, etc.)					
d. The lecturer presented orally more than they read					
Lecturer's Ability to Present the Lecture and Presence					
a. The lecturer's speech was distinct, clear, and audible					
b. The lecturer was able to maintain the audience's attention and discipline					
c. The lecturer was respectful toward the audience					
d. The lecturer fully and effectively used the time period allocated for the lecture					

Would you like the same lecturer to deliver a lecture to you again?

☐ [] Yes

☐ [] No