

YEREVAN STATE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY AFTER M. HERATSI

EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT AND ASSURANCE CENTER

"EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MODULAR EDUCATION"

Summary of Survey Results

- ❑ Academic Year: 2025-26, 1st Semester
- ❑ Educational Program: "Dentistry"
- ❑ Participants: 91 first-year students of the program (45%)
- ❑ Survey Format: Online

1. Indicate your academic performance

The overwhelming majority of students who participated in the survey (82%) reported "good" academic performance, while the proportion of students with "excellent" and "satisfactory" performance was 9% respectively. This indicates that the survey results primarily represent the opinions of students with above-average academic performance.

2. On a 1-5 point scale, rate the effectiveness of modular education

Most students rated the effectiveness of modular education at 4 and 5 points, indicating an overall positive attitude toward the system. Concurrently, there are also average ratings, which point to the necessity for improvement.

3. During the study of the modules mentioned below, did you have a clear understanding of:

- ❑ a) their structure (the proportions of different subjects)?
- ❑ b) their assessment methodology?
- ❑ c) their expected learning outcomes (what you should know and be able to do upon completing the module)?

The majority of students indicated that they clearly understood the structure, assessment methodology, and expected learning outcomes of the modules. The highest indicators were

recorded regarding the assessment methodology, whereas the comprehension of learning outcomes is relatively lower in certain modules.

4. On a 1-5 point scale, rate how interconnected and coordinated the materials taught by different departments were in the modules mentioned below (1 - absolutely uncoordinated and contained contradictory data, 5 - fully coordinated and complemented each other).

Content interconnectivity between subjects was evaluated mostly as above average; however, a relatively large proportion of low ratings is observed, especially in the 3rd module. This indicates the need for further improvement in interdisciplinary integration.

5. On a 1-5 point scale, rate the extent to which test questions formulated by different departments on the same topic and their correct answers coincided in the modules mentioned below (1 - absolutely did not coincide and contained contradictory data, 5 - fully coincided):

The consistency of test questions across different departments was generally evaluated positively, but a segment of students noted in the comments thematic inconsistencies and contradictory data presented across different subjects, particularly in the 2nd and 3rd modules.

6. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: All topics envisioned by the course syllabus can be studied in depth within the allocated timeframe (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree):

Although some students consider the allocated timeframe to be sufficient, a significant portion stated that it is inadequate for the in-depth mastery of topics, particularly for high-volume subjects. This issue is most evident in anatomy, histology, and physiology.

7. On a 1-5 point scale, rate the module's subject lectures (1 - very poor, 5 - very good):

Lectures primarily received high ratings, especially in clinical and core professional subjects. At the same time, individual comments suggested making the lectures more interactive and synchronizing them with practical classes.

8. On a 1-5 point scale, rate the module's subject practical classes (1 - very poor, 5 - very good):

Practical classes were rated higher than lectures. This demonstrates that students consider practical and applied learning formats to be more effective.

9. On a 1-5 point scale, rate your retained knowledge after studying the modules mentioned below:

The majority of students evaluated their retained knowledge at an above-average level. Concurrently, differences between modules are noticeable, which may be attributed to the specific features of subject integration and teaching organization.

10. Rate the proportionality of the exam question distribution: did the subjects with more instructional hours have a correspondingly larger specific weight in the exam test?

A significant portion of the students agree that the distribution of exam questions largely corresponds to the volume of subject instructional hours, however, there is also dissatisfaction regarding the specific weight of test questions for certain subjects.

11. On average, how many hours per week did you spend on independent work and preparation for this course (excluding lectures and practical classes)?

The data indicates that the majority of students allocate 3–6 hours per week for independent work for each subject.

12. In your opinion, does the grade received during the certification reflect your actual knowledge?

Student opinions were divided: while the majority believe that the received grade reflects their knowledge, a significant portion within each module holds the opposite view. This indicates a need to further increase trust in the assessment system.

13. Comments

Qualitative analysis of the comments shows that the primary concerns of students are related to academic workload, content and chronological integration of subjects, as well as the organization of the assessment system. Students particularly emphasize the logical sequence of subjects included in the modules, the synchronized teaching of topics, and the organization of learning based on the gradual formation of professional knowledge. A specifically positive example was the structural design of modules where topics of different subjects complement each other, demonstrating that effective interdisciplinary integration is viewed as a fundamental condition for the success of modular education.

CONCLUSION

The survey results show that first-year students generally evaluate the organization of modular education and its effectiveness positively, specifically: the comprehensibility of the module structures, the quality of lectures and practical classes, as well as the achievement of learning outcomes. At the same time, a number of issues were identified that limit the full effectiveness of modular learning. These primarily concern the academic workload, the content and chronological coordination of the subjects included in the modules, the adequacy of allocated hours, as well as specific components of the assessment system.

The qualitative analysis of the comments confirms the quantitative results: students emphasize the logical sequencing of topics across different subjects, closer collaboration between departments,

alignment of educational materials and test questions, as well as the increase of practical classes and instructional hours for professional subjects. The organization of modules where the subject topics complement each other and are studied simultaneously was evaluated exceptionally positively.

Overall, the survey results indicate that the implementation of modular education is evaluated as an effective educational approach. However, to ensure its maximum impact, it is necessary to continuously improve the module structures, interdisciplinary integration, workload distribution, and assessment mechanisms based on student feedback.