



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Faculty Members' Evaluations Regarding the Faculty Development Program Conducted with the Hybrid Learning Method

Hibrit Öğrenme Yöntemiyle Uygulanan Eğitici Gelişimi Programına İlişkin Tıp Fakültesi Öğretim Üyelerinin Değerlendirmeleri

¹S. Ayhan Çalıřkan , ²Nadire Ünver Dođan 

¹Ege University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical Education, İzmir, Turkey.

²Selçuk University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Anatomy, Konya, Turkey.

Correspondence

S. Ayhan Çalıřkan, Ege Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Tıp Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Dekanlık Binası Kat:2, 35100 Bornova, İzmir, Türkiye

E-Mail: ayhan.caliskan@ege.edu.tr

How to cite ?

Çalıřkan SA, Ünver Dođan N. Faculty Members' Evaluations Regarding the Faculty Development Program Conducted with the Hybrid Learning Method. Genel Tıp Derg.2022; 32(4):366-371

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study aims to determine faculty members' feedback and the level of satisfaction about the faculty development program carried out with the hybrid learning method at Selçuk University Faculty of Medicine (SUFoM) and compare faculty members' satisfaction levels regarding face-to-face and online sessions.

Material and Methods: The Faculty Development Program has been carried out since 2010 and updated with program evaluations as well as faculty members' needs and expectations. In the COVID-19 pandemic era, distance education and hybrid education sessions were added to the program. The renewed faculty development program was conducted in June 2021 with a hybrid learning method, eight sessions both face-to-face and online and six sessions online only. The feedback of the participants was obtained through online questionnaires consisting of structured items rated with Likert-type scales (1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree and 0: Very poor – 10: Very good) and semi-structured items.

Results: Fifty faculty members participated in the program and 30 (60.0%) answered the research questionnaires. Faculty members reported a total of 170 session participation, 140 (82.4%) face-to-face and 30 (17.6%) online. It was determined that the participants' satisfaction levels about the faculty development program sessions was high and very high (min=4.05±0.99 ; max=5.00±0.00). It was also found that there is no statistically significant difference between faculty members evaluations for online or face-to-face participation in the training sessions. Participants reported that their overall evaluation of the program was very good (9.33±0.65).

Conclusion: The SUFoM Faculty Development Program, designed in accordance with the COVID-19 conditions, has been successfully implemented using the hybrid method. The positive feedback of faculty members and the fact that online or face-to-face participation in the sessions does not make a difference in their satisfaction levels is considered as an important development for the implementation of the forthcoming faculty development program using the hybrid method.

Keywords: Faculty Development, Hybrid Learning, Blended Learning, Mixed-Mode Learning, Program Evaluation, COVID-19

Öz

Amaç: Bu arařtırmada, Selçuk Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesinde (SÜTF) hibrit öğrenme yöntemi ile gerçekleştirilen eğitici gelişimi programına ilişkin katılımcı öğretim üyelerinin geri bildirimlerinin alınması ve yüz yüze ve çevrim içi (online) gerçekleştirilen eğitim etkinliklerine ilişkin beğeni düzeylerinin belirlenmesi ve karşılaştırılması amaçlanmıştır.

Gereç ve yöntem: Eğitici Gelişimi Programı, SÜTF'de 2010 yılından bu yana öğretim üyelerinin beklenti ve gereksinimleri ile programın değerlendirilme verileri ışığında güncellenerek uygulanmıştır. Programa COVID-19 pandemisi döneminde uzaktan eğitim ve hibrit eğitimin SÜTF'de uygulanmasıyla ilgili oturumlar eklenmiştir. Yenilenen eğitici gelişimi programı Haziran 2021'de, hibrit öğrenme yöntemi ile sekiz oturum hem yüz yüze hem de çevrim içi, altı oturum ise yalnızca çevrim içi olacak biçimde sunulmuştur. Katılımcıların geri bildirimleri Likert tipi ölççekler (1: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum – 5: Kesinlikle katılıyorum ve 0: Çok kötü – 10: Çok iyi) ile değerlendirilen yapılandırılmış maddeler ve yarı yapılandırılmış maddelerden oluşan çevrim içi anket formlarıyla alınmıştır.

Bulgular: Programa 50 öğretim üyesi katılmış ve 30'u (%60,0) arařtırma anket formlarını yanıtlamıştır. Öğretim üyeleri, 140 (%82,4) yüz yüze, 30 (%17,6) çevrim içi olmak üzere toplam 170 oturum katılımı bildirmişlerdir. Katılımcıların eğitici gelişimi programı oturumlarına ilişkin beğenilerinin yüksek ve çok yüksek düzeyde gerçekleştiği saptanmıştır (min=4,05±0,99 ; maks=5,00±0,00). Öğretim üyelerinin bu değerlendirmelerde verdiği puanların, eğitim oturumlarına çevrim içi veya yüz yüze katılma durumuna göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık göstermediği saptanmıştır. Katılımcılar programına ilişkin genel değerlendirmelerinin çok iyi olduğunu (9,33±0,65) bildirmiştir.

Sonuç: COVID-19 koşullarına uygun olarak tasarlanan SÜTF Eğitici Gelişimi Programı hibrit yöntem kullanılarak başari ile uygulanmıştır. Öğretim üyelerinin olumlu geri bildirimleri ve oturumlara çevrim içi veya yüz yüze katılmanın beğeni düzeylerinde fark oluşturmaması önümüzdeki dönemde de eğitici gelişimi programının hibrit yöntem kullanılarak uygulanması için yönünde önemli bir gelişme olarak değerlendirilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eğitici Gelişimi, Hibrit Öğrenme, Harmanlanmış Öğrenme, Karma Öğrenme, Program Değerlendirme, COVID-19

Introduction

In recent years, medical schools have increased their efforts to provide faculty development programs for educators. In line with the new developments in education, training, and measurement and evaluation, medical schools and other educational institutions offer a variety of programs and activities to support faculty members develop their knowledge and skills as educators (1). Faculty development encompasses all activities undertaken by faculty members (faculty member, leader, manager,

researcher, and academician) in order to improve their educational knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward both individual and group tasks (2). Traditionally, these efforts are conducted through official programs at medical schools and other educational institutions. Recently, it has also been suggested that faculty members continue their educational development in different environments and with activities other than formal training (1,3). Faculty development program implementation strategies include workplace learning, peer coaching and mentoring, workshops and seminars, longitudinal programs, and online learning (2).

When the technological capabilities of the 21st century are combined with educational activities and educational environments, a structure is created with very high accessibility and flexibility to all resources (e.g., *educational materials, faculty members*) (4).

Education based on the technological implications of the present (e.g., *web, internet*) is having a greater impact on traditional higher education activities. Internet-based education has become an indispensable part of all educational stages, especially due to the mandatory conditions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic (5). A unique educational opportunity is created when traditional face-to-face education and internet-based education are combined in some way. This educational opportunity will both enhance student learning more than either environment alone could do, while also maximizing the advantages of both the online and face-to-face environments (5,6). In this context, the use of both internet-based and traditional face-to-face training components is defined as hybrid learning (3,6).

Hybrid learning, blended learning and mixed-mode learning are the terms used interchangeably in the literature and to define the use or blend of two or more training techniques (4,7-9). In addition, it is stated that hybrid learning, and blended learning are two terms that usually refer to a single concept. Some researchers define blended or hybrid learning as the use of a mixed teaching method that combines traditional face-to-face teaching with pure online learning. However, some researchers argue that distance education is the main focus of hybrid learning and it is supported by traditional education, and blended learning is the method that combines conventional and new educational approaches in the form of best practice (4). In other words, blended learning is defined as the use of traditional classroom education with existing technological opportunities. Hybrid learning, on the other hand, is defined as the use of e-learning elements in the form of computer-based and web-based education while the educators and students come together face-to-face (10). We employ the term 'hybrid learning' to describe the instructional methods used in this study.

In Turkey, there are a wide range of hybrid learning method implementation examples available, ranging

from primary education to post-graduate education (11). The institutional advantages of hybrid learning include the following: to be able to reach a wider range of learners by offering face-to-face or remote participation; to access education regardless of location and thus to provide a more inclusive education and equality in learning; to carry out the training that should conventionally be given in a certain place with remote access; to contact and consult experts more easily; and to eliminate the need to repeat the same training more than once (12).

From the learner's perspective, hybrid learning also has advantages, such as providing learners with the flexibility to participate in the training whenever they choose, responding better to different learner characteristics by combining the two methods, and providing the opportunity to learn how to work with technology. In addition, the hybrid learning method reportedly gives students a greater sense of control over their learning (12).

Selçuk University, Faculty of Medicine (SUFoM) established in 2002-2003 academic year. The main goal of the faculty is stated as; *"To educate physicians who are fully equipped with professional knowledge and skills, respectful of ethical and moral values, competent and successful in their field, have proper communication and empathy with colleagues and patients, have adopted the principle of service to humanity, think rationally and innovatively, are sensitive to their environment, who are social, can improve themselves."* In order to achieve and the principle of *"continuous improvement of the qualifications of educators and lecturers"* has been adopted (13). In this sense, SUFoM organizes regular continuous professional development activities to enhance the knowledge and skills of faculty members regarding education and training.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic all over the world as well as in Türkiye, almost all of the educational activities at every phase of medical education have moved to the online environment. This situation has changed with the decision to vaccinate health professionals, clerkship students, and interns in the first place in the COVID-19 vaccination program of the Republic of Turkish Ministry of Health (14). Thus, it has become possible to conduct face-to-face educational activities for medical faculty members and students provided that the protective measures are followed (15,16).

Within the context of these advancements, the faculty development program at SUFoM is presented with an innovative approach and hybrid learning method. Determining the extent to which the currently implemented innovative faculty development program that meets the participants' expectations and its areas for improvement will substantially contribute to the enhancement of future comparable programs. This study aims to present the feedback and evaluations of the participating faculty members regarding the faculty development program carried out with the hybrid

learning method at SUFoM and their level of satisfaction with the face-to-face and online sessions in the program.

Material Method

This research, designed as a cross-sectional survey, was carried out with volunteer faculty members (N=50) who participated in the faculty development program held in June 2021 at SUFoM.

Development of the program

The current program has been developed according to the needs of faculty members and to meet the requirements of the medical school's curriculum. Since its first implementation in 2010, the faculty program has been updated and implemented in the light of current advancements, curriculum requirements, expectations and needs of faculty members, and information obtained from the evaluations of the program. During the COVID-19 pandemic period, sessions about online education and hybrid education as well as their implementation at SUFoM were included to the content of the program.

A total of 10 hours of faculty development program was carried out in June 2021 in three consecutive days with the hybrid learning method. Training sessions were limited to a maximum of 40 minutes to ensure the focus of online participants and technological resources (e.g., internet, mobile devices) were utilized in content sharing to maintain the highest level of engagement.

Implementation

Of the 14 sessions in the program, eight were conducted both face-to-face and online, while six were conducted online solely (Table 1). Face-to-face training was held in SUFoM training halls, while online training was simultaneously streamed via the SUFoM distance education system (UZEM). Faculty members attended the sessions face-to-face or online, depending on their preferences.

Data Collection Tool

For the evaluation of the program, faculty members were asked to fill in an online questionnaire at the end of each session. In the anonymously answered questionnaire, participants' gender, years of experience, department, academic title, and type of attendance at the sessions were questioned. The questionnaire also contained four structured items asking the content, duration, trainer competency, and presentation style of each session. In addition, there were three structured items about the course as a whole and three semi-structured open-ended items where participants could express their thoughts in written form. Structured items were asked to be rated on Likert-type scales (1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree or 0: Very bad – 10: Very good).

Table 1. Faculty development program agenda

1 st Day
- Introduction – Participant expectations – Program objectives
- SUFoM education system – Accreditation, Progress Test
- Information on TIPSAD
- Planning an educational session*
- Creating positive learning environment**
2 nd Day
- Effective presentation techniques
- Distance education
- Giving constructive feedback*
- Introduction to assessment in Medical Education*
3 rd Day
- Hybrid education and SUFoM Distance Education System (UZEM)
- Participants' Presentations
- Multiple Choice Questions*
- Performance assessment*
- Evaluation of the program and closure

* Solely online sessions

Analysis

Microsoft Excel and IBM Statistics SPSS 25.0 were used in data analysis. The quantitative data were presented with tables and graphics. Percentage distributions were used for categorical variables and mean & standard deviation calculations were used for numerical variables. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the differences between the scores given by the participants to the evaluation domains according to their online and face-to-face participation and a value of $p < 0.05$ was accepted for statistical significance.

Ethic

Ethical approval of this study was obtained from the SUFoM Ethics Board dated 26.05.2021 reference number 2021/10, and the participants voluntarily answered the questionnaires.

Results

Out of 50 participants, 30 (60.0%) faculty members answered the questionnaires. The demographic characteristics of the participants included in the analyzes are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of the participants (n=30)

	N	%
Gender		
Female	8	26.7
Male	18	60.0
No response	4	13.3
Academic title		
Professor	3	10.0
Associate Professor	10	33.3
Assistant Professor	13	43.3
No response	4	13.3
Department		
Basic Sciences	4	13.3
Clinical (Internal Medicine)	13	43.3
Clinical (Surgery)	9	30.0
No response	4	13.3
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Experience (years)	4.44	±4.19

In the evaluations, content, trainer competency, and presentation style of the sessions were rated high and very high (min 4.05 ± 0.99 ; max 5.00 ± 0.00) by the respondents. In addition, the length of the sessions was rated as moderately satisfactory (min= 2.17 ± 0.62 ; max= 3.00 ± 1.73). The highest mean score was found in the "Performance Assessment" session, and the lowest mean score was found in the "Information on TIPSAD" session. The mean scores of all sessions in all evaluation domains are presented in Table 3.

At the end of the faculty development program, respondents reported a total of 170 session participation. 140 (82.4%) of these participations were face-to-face and 30 (17.6%) were online. In the comparative analysis, there was no statistically significant difference between faculty members evaluations for online or face-to-face participation in the training sessions ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

Faculty development program respondents stated that: they found the WhatsApp group, which was established to strengthen communication throughout

the program, very useful (9.42 ± 0.99), they were highly likely to use the knowledge and skills they gained from the training (8.83 ± 1.53), and their overall evaluation regarding the program was very good (9.33 ± 0.65). Faculty members submitted a total of 36 written statements to semi-structured evaluation items. Among those, "Multiple Choice Questions" session was stated as the most useful session (n=7, 19.4%), and participants emphasized that there no missing point in the program (n=12, 33.3%).

Discussion

In this study, faculty members' feedback and evaluations were investigated regarding the faculty development program implemented using the hybrid method at SUFoM. It has been determined that the majority of the faculty members attended the training sessions online, their satisfaction with the program was high, and there was no statistically significant difference between and the evaluation scores of face-to-face or online attendance. Respondents also found the WhatsApp communication group very useful and stated that they would use the knowledge and skills they acquired in their teaching activities. Participants reported their overall evaluation as "very good" for the program.

In a systematic review, the quality of medical education faculty development programs employed in the United States, Canada, Israel, Sweden, and Germany was evaluated. There were programs with varying durations and training methodologies, but neither hybrid nor online-only programs were indicated. (17). Although there were no hybrid or online implemented programs reported in another systematic review, participating faculty members stated a high level of satisfaction regarding the programs, which was in line with our study. Participants also considered the programs to be beneficial and conducive to their personal objectives (18). In our study, it was determined that the faculty members mostly attended the sessions face-to-face, yet there was no difference in satisfaction levels between online and face-to-face participants. It is

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of session scores for evaluation domains (1: Strongly disagree - 5: Strongly agree).

Session	Evaluation Domain			
	The session content met my expectations	The session duration was short	The trainer was competent	I liked the way the topic was presented
	Mean ± standard deviation			
SUFoM education system – Accreditation – Progress Test	4,27±0,87	2,73±0,98	4,55±0,74	4,45±0,74
Information on TIPSAD	4,05±0,99	3,00±0,97	4,55±0,76	4,15±0,88
Planning an educational session - Creating positive learning environment	4,38±0,92	2,38±0,97	4,79±0,66	4,67±0,48
Giving constructive feedback	4,65±0,49	2,30±1,02	4,91±0,29	4,78±0,42
Introduction to assessment in Medical Education	4,73±0,45	2,27±0,98	4,90±0,31	4,73±0,45
Hybrid education and SUFoM Distance Education System (UZEM)	4,28±0,75	2,17±0,62	4,56±0,62	4,39±0,70
Multiple Choice Questions	4,88±0,33	2,47±1,33	4,94±0,24	4,82±0,39
Performance assessment	5,00±0,00	3,00±1,73	5,00±0,00	5,00±0,00

Table 4. The Mann-Whitney U test results for evaluation domains according to the session attendance

Evaluation domains	Session attendance	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	U	p
The session content met my expectations	Online	137	84.94	11636.5	1926.5	0.533
	Face to face	30	79.72	2391.5		
The session duration was short	Online	134	79.14	10604.5	1559.5	0.080
	Face to face	29	95.22	2761.5		
The trainer was competent	Online	134	83.99	11254.0	1677.0	0.090
	Face to face	29	72.83	2112.0		
I liked the way the topic was presented	Online	134	83.82	11232.0	1699.0	0.201
	Face to face	29	73.59	2134.0		

believed that online or hybrid educational activities can be used as an alternative to face-to-face education under challenging situations.

In a recent study systematically reviewing the developments in medical education in the COVID-19 pandemic until May 2020, three publications reported on the faculty development programs; however, none utilized online or hybrid methods (19). Probably as elsewhere in the world, the faculty development programs of Turkish medical schools were implemented as face-to-face training activities before the COVID-19 outbreak. With the outbreak of the pandemic, faculty needs, especially regarding distance education tools and educational methods, and their desire and expectations to receive training in this field, have emerged.

University and faculty administrations responded to these expectations as quickly as possible and organized faculty development programs (20–23). In a meta-analysis study investigating the educational programs applied through hybrid learning methods, it was reported that the instructor and participatory evaluations were positive (11).

The generalizability of the results of this research is restricted by the fact that it was only carried out at SUFoM with the participation of a limited number of volunteer faculty members. According to Kirkpatrick's evaluation of educational programs approach, this research conducted a first-level program evaluation as it receives only the reactions of participants. In terms of establishing the efficacy of the faculty development program, the evidence would be strengthened if it included faculty members' learning and application of the program-acquired knowledge and skills in their own educational activities.

In our study, the faculty development program was successfully implemented using the hybrid method and the program positively endorsed by the participants. The hybrid approach to structuring a faculty

development program is expected to increase the program's efficacy and participant satisfaction by making training more adaptable to individual needs. In light of the program's success and the valuable input it has generated, SUFoM intends to launch a series of faculty development programs and maintain its commitment to the hybrid approach.

Acknowledgement

We would like to extend our thanks to deans of SUFoM Prof. Yavuz Selvi (Dean), Prof. İnci Kara (Vice Dean) for supporting the implementation of faculty development program, Prof. Kamil Hakan Doğan, Halime Okutan Topal, Muammer Faruk Yıldırım and Muammer Ali Deliktaş for their valuable contributions to the educational activities. We would also like to thank Aleyna Emeksiz for her efforts during the article's development and Seyfi Durmaz for his insightful comments and feedback. We would like to extend our sincere appreciation to the SUFoM faculty members who participated in the course program and contributed their feedback on this study.

References

- Steinert Y, Mann K, Anderson B, Barnett BM, Centeno A, Naismith L, et al. A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40 [Internet]. Vol. 38, Medical Teacher. Taylor and Francis Ltd; 2016 [cited 2021 May 23]. p. 769–86. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851>
- Steinert Y. Faculty development in the health professions: A Focus on Research and Practice. Faculty Development in the Health Professions: A Focus on Research and Practice. 2014.
- McLean M, Cilliers F, Van Wyk J. Faculty development: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. Med Teach [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2021 May 23];30(6):555–84. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590802109834>
- Abdelrahman N, Beverly J. I. Hybrid Learning: Perspectives of Higher Education Faculty. Int J Inf Commun Technol Hum Dev [Internet]. 2016 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Jul 17];8(1):1–25. Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.4018/IJICTHD.2016010101>
- Rajab MH, Gazal AM, Alkattan K. Challenges to Online Medical Education During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Cureus [Internet]. 2020

- Jul 2 [cited 2021 May 23];12(7). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7398724/
- 6.Meydanlıođlu A, Arkan F. Effect of Hybrid Learning in Higher Education. *Int J Inf Commun Technol Educ* [Internet]. 2014 Apr 2 [cited 2021 May 23];8(2):5. Available from: <https://zenodo.org/record/1092346>
- 7.Charles R. G, Charles D. Blended Learning Environments. In: Spector JM, Merrill MD, Merrienboer J van, Driscoll MP, editors. *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. 3rd ed. Routledge; 2008. p. 269–76.
- 8.Gleason BW, Greenhow C. Hybrid Education: The Potential of Teaching and Learning with Robot-Mediated Communication. *Online Learn* [Internet]. 2017 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Jul 17];21(4):159–76. Available from: <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/1276>
- 9.European Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training. Blended learning (hybrid learning or mixed-mode learning) - Eqavet [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 17]. Available from: [https://www.eqavet.eu/eu-quality-assurance/glossary/blended-learning-\(hybrid-learning-or-mixed-mode-le](https://www.eqavet.eu/eu-quality-assurance/glossary/blended-learning-(hybrid-learning-or-mixed-mode-le)
- 10.Behjat F, Yamini M, Bagheri MS. Blended Learning: A Ubiquitous Learning Environment for Reading Comprehension. *Int J English Linguist* [Internet]. 2012 Jan 30 [cited 2021 Jul 17];2(1):p97. Available from: <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijel/article/view/14672>
- 11.Korucu AT, Kabak K. Türkiye'de Hibrit Öğrenme Uygulamaları ve Etkileri: Bir Meta Analiz Çalışması. *Bilgi ve İletişim Teknoloji Dergisi* [Internet]. 2020;2(2):88–112. Available from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/bited/issue/58421/803227>
- 12.Raes A, Detienne L, Windey I, Depaepe F. A systematic literature review on synchronous hybrid learning: gaps identified. *Learn Environ Res* 2019 233 [Internet]. 2019 Nov 28 [cited 2021 Jul 30];23(3):269–90. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10984-019-09303-z>
- 13.Selçuk Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://www.selcuk.edu.tr/Hakkinda/tip>
- 14.Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Sağlık Bakanlığı. Aşı Uygulanacak Grup Sıralaması [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://covid19asi.saglik.gov.tr/TR-77707/asi-uygulanacak-grup-siralamasi.html>
- 15.Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Sağlık Bakanlığı. Sağlık Kurumlarında Çalışma Rehberi ve Enfeksiyon Kontrol Önlemleri [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://covid19.saglik.gov.tr/TR-66532/saglik-kurumlarinda-calisma-rehberi-ve-enfeksiyon-kontrol-onlemleri.html>
- 16.Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu (YÖK). 2020-2021 Eğitim ve Öğretim Yılı Bahar Dönemine İlişkin Açıklama (17.02.2021) [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://covid19.yok.gov.tr/HaberBelgeleri/2020-2021-Bahar-donemine-iliskin-aciklama/2020-2021-bahar-donemine-iliskin-aciklama.pdf>
- 17.Leslie K, Baker L, Egan-Lee E, Esdaile M, Reeves S. Advancing faculty development in medical education: A systematic review. *Acad Med* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2021 Oct 29];88(7):1038–45. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2013/07000/Advancing_Faculty_Development_in_Medical.38.aspx
- 18.Steinert Y, Mann K, Centeno A, Dolmans D, Spencer J, Gelula M, et al. A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education: BEME Guide No. 8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600902976> [Internet]. 2009 Sep [cited 2021 Oct 29];28(6):497–526. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01421590600902976>
- 19.Gordon M, Patricio M, Home L, Muston A, Alston SR, Pammi M, et al. Developments in medical education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: A rapid BEME systematic review: BEME Guide No. 63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X20201807484> [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1 [cited 2021 Oct 29];42(11):1202–15. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1807484>
- 20.Akar N, Ekmekci P, Öziş S. Distance Education Experience of TOBB ETÜ Faculty of Medicine during the Covid-19 Pandemic Process. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Oct 29];20(60–1):11–
5. Available from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/doi/10.25282/ted.779357>
- 21.Demir T, Aytuğ Koşan AM, Toraman Ç. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Faculty of Medicine (ÇOMÜTF) Experience Regarding the COVID-19 Outbreak Process. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Oct 29];20(60–1):16–20. Available from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/doi/10.25282/ted.777744>
- 22.Öztürk Ş, Ak A, Ünver N, Fazlıođulları Z, Göktaş S. Education Experience of Selçuk University Faculty of Medicine During The Covid-19 Pandemic. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Oct 29];20(60–1):21–6. Available from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/doi/10.25282/ted.768387>
- 23.Elçin M, Çiftçi Atılgan SB, Öztoprak M, Taşdelen Teker G, Sezer B, Demirören M, et al. Experiences of Hacettepe University Faculty of Medicine Amidst COVID-19 Pandemic. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Oct 29];20(60–1):125–30. Available from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/doi/10.25282/ted.795516>
- 24.Kirkpatrick DL, Kirkpatrick JD. *Evaluating Training Programs The Four Levels* [Internet]. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.; 2006 [cited 2020 Nov 4]. 399 p. Available from: [https://www.scip.org/S\(1z5mqp453ed_snp55rgjct55\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=2702697](https://www.scip.org/S(1z5mqp453ed_snp55rgjct55)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=2702697)