

Evaluation of Epidemiological Research Training Course VI-2

Summary: A team of Japanese and Vietnamese lecturers succeeded in training about 100 participants. On the management side, significant achievements were recruitment of participants from a wide southern region and having supports from guest lecturers from Singapore and Fukushima Prefecture. Most participants answered that the course was useful. The Course VI-2 focused on teaching biostatistics, and a half answered that their confidence in analyzing data increased. It was noteworthy that participants' self-evaluation was significantly higher for the repeat participants. We will upgrade our teaching in order to respond to varying needs of participants recruited widely and with different levels of knowledge and skills.

1. Characteristics of participants

There were 119 registrants, and 99 completed the course successfully. Fifteen graduates were from outside Ho Chi Minh City, covering the wide south region (Tay Ninh, Soc Trang, Binh Dinh, Can Tho, Dong Nai, Kien Giang, Ben Tre, Quang Ngai, Khanh Hoa, and Dong Thap) and three regions in the north and central (Hai Dung, Hanoi, and Da Lat).

2. Course evaluation survey

Sixty-five participants responded to the course evaluation survey. Median duration of working in medicine was 3 years (ranged from 0 to 30). Forty-two percent of participants were first-time attendants. Most agreed that the course was useful and were interested in attending a future course. However, the overall level was perceived as rather difficult among 60% of participants. As for the Fukushima Open Seminar, 85% answered that it was interesting.

Table 1-1. Participants' course evaluation

		N (%) (Total N=65)					
		1	2	3	4	5	
Usefulness of the course	Poor	1 (2)	0 (0)	5 (8)	27 (42)	<u>31 (48)</u>	Superior
Overall level	Easy	1 (2)	2 (3)	23 (35)	<u>30 (46)</u>	9 (14)	Difficult
Selection of topics	Poor	1 (2)	1 (2)	14 (22)	<u>34 (52)</u>	15 (23)	Superior
Useful of materials	Poor	1 (2)	1 (2)	6 (9)	<u>35 (54)</u>	22 (34)	Superior
Course duration	Too short	2 (3)	11 (17)	<u>30 (46)</u>	20 (31)	2 (3)	Too long
Interest in attending a future course	Not at all	1 (2)	2 (3)	4 (6)	23 (36)	<u>34 (53)</u>	Very much

Note: Most frequent answers are underlined.

Table 1-2. Participants' course evaluation: Fukushima Open Seminar

		N (%) (Total N=65)					
		1	2	3	4	5	
Interest in the Fukushima Open Seminar	Poor	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (16)	<u>28 (44)</u>	26 (41)	Superior

3. Self-evaluation of achievement

Seventy-seven percent answered that their knowledge in biostatistics increased and 59% answered that their confidence in analyzing increased. As for confidence in study designing, which was taught in the previous course, participants' self-evaluations was relatively lower as expected. When first-time and repeated participants were compared, it was obvious that the self-evaluation of the latter group was significantly higher.

Table 2-1. Participants' self-evaluation of achievement

	N (%) (Total N=65)				
	1. Strongly disagree	2. Disagree	3. Neutral	4. Agree	5. Strongly agree
"My knowledge in Epidemiology increased"	1 (2)	3 (5)	9 (14)	<u>41 (63)</u>	11 (17)
"My knowledge in Biostatistics increased"	1 (2)	4 (6)	10 (15)	<u>39 (60)</u>	11 (17)
"I gained confidence in understanding scientific evidence / articles."	1 (2)	4 (6)	22 (34)	<u>29 (45)</u>	9 (14)
"I gained confidence in my skills to design a study."	1 (2)	3 (5)	<u>32 (49)</u>	25 (38)	4 (6)
"I gained confidence in analyzing data."	1 (2)	3 (5)	23 (35)	<u>33 (51)</u>	5 (8)
"I gained confidence in conducting epidemiological research."	3 (5)	10 (15)	22 (34)	<u>27 (42)</u>	3 (5)

Note: Most frequent answers are underlined.

Table 2-2. Participants' self-evaluation of achievement: Repeat vs first-time participants

	N (%) of 4 and 5		P value
	Repeat (N=38)	First-time (N=27)	
"My knowledge in Epidemiology increased"	32 (84)	20 (74)	0.31
"My knowledge in Biostatistics increased"	30 (79)	20 (74)	0.65
"I gained confidence in understanding scientific evidence / articles."	27 (71)	11 (41)	0.02
"I gained confidence in my skills to design a study."	21 (55)	8 (30)	0.04
"I gained confidence in analyzing data."	26 (68)	12 (44)	0.05
"I gained confidence in conducting epidemiological research."	22 (58)	8 (30)	0.02

Chi-square test was used.