Minicase data

1) Spring 14 – Minicase 1 was just given to the students. They received feedback to make sure they include the two types of data (microbe characteristics and disease info). Therefore the grading for the 1st minicase is always lenient and does not represent mastery of knowledge.

2) Fall 14 – Minicase 1 changed so the students focus on which info they think is important and why. The idea was this would allow them to understand the importance of the info given and how it applies to identifying the organism. This was reviewed in class when handed back.

Data

Spring 14

For Minicase 2:

N=39, the average was 6/7 points. I did not track how many students correctly identified data.

Fall 14

For Minicase 1:

N=43 70% of the students identified bacteria info as important, 25 identified both bacterial and disease info, 5% clueless

For Minicase 2:

N=43, the average was 5/7 points.

56% identified bacteria as important with 26% successfully identifying both bacterial and disease info as important. Of the remaining 18% 2/43 (5%) students were clueless, the others had ancillary info but did not tie it to answering the question.

It appears I made the situation worse for the students. In retrospect I think we did not go over the idea well enough, maybe needed some more time for discussion.

OR

By jumping in and immediately doing an unmodified minicase students learn better? Maybe I already had an optimal system?

I think I will return to my original process BUT when we review Minicase #1 in class I will have them compare their answers with their neighbors and have the class come up with what info is needed and why.