Microbial Pathogenesis

Mid-Semester Student Feedback

HM
hannah.mcmillan@duke.edu
hamcmillan.com
linkedin.com/in/hamcmillan

Overview

To collect mid-semester feedback, students were asked to answer three questions during the last five minutes of class. Answers were recorded on index cards and used to inform my teaching strategies for the remaining discussion sessions throughout the semester. The three questions were:

1. What was your major take-away from the paper we discussed today?
2. What was one thing you liked about the way class was structured? What helped you learn the most during today's discussion?
3. Do you have any questions or suggestions for how to improve class in the future?

Student Responses

Student 1	1. Cool paper, figures were straight forward. 2. I liked how you had stuff written on the board (goals, thoughts on the paper). 3. The syllabus just has "Exam 1" listed for Feb. 4th. Is there a lecture or do we not show up?
Student 2	1. I think it's very cool that the OMVs could be a whole other class of virulence secretion pathways. 2. What you explained about OMVs only being from the outer membrane while the effectors are not found in the periplasm is fascinating – are there any current theories to explain this? 3. I liked breaking figures up into partner discussions, although I think it could've been helpful to go around the room and have each group say something.
Student 3	1. Major take away – Pathogens are capable of interacting with each other over long distances, which makes the picture of microbial pathogenesis in our body much more complex. 2. One thing I liked about the class – TA is really nice and well-prepared, impressive! 3. Suggestions – you did a fantastic job! I enjoyed the class. No suggestions. Thanks.
Student 4	1. T3SS effectors are associated not only with bacteria themselves but also with OMVs. 2. You are responsive to emails. 3. [blank]

HM | hannah.mcmillan@duke.edu
hamcmillan.com
linkedin.com/in/hamcmillan

Student 5

1. The thought about gram-negative bacteria use OMVs to translocate some factors into the cell before invasion then promote the invasion.
2. I like the pre-assignment part, it gives me a lot of chance to think about solving a question, and I can compare my solution with authors!
3. No question, pretty enjoy!

Student 6

1. OMVs having the capacity to translocate T3SS effectors and their huge presence in increasing virulence of the isolate.
2. I liked the structure and letting students choose 4 items to evaluate could be a good modification.
3. Should we email you our response for the figure discussion?

Student 7

1. What I took away is that simple assays like prot K and blotting can still answer complex questions especially in conjunction with modern techniques and vesicles are cool!
2. I liked the non-judgmental atmosphere!
3. Suggestion – since we all did the pre-class assignment we should all have answers (lol) so maybe starting at one end of the table and having people answer in order would help move Q&A along! ☺

Student 8

1. I really took away that OMVs impact Salmonella's ability to invade a host cell. The effector proteins contained within them do make them more virulent. It would be cool to look at ways in which OMV formation can be inhibited.
2. I really liked the organization of the class! It was fun trying to compare our guesses for experiments to the ones used in the paper. I would recommend that this teaching style be continued in future sessions.
3. [blank]

Student 9

1. OMVs are capable of utilizing machinery of a T3SS to infect host cells via clathrin mediated endocytosis.
2. Pros: open forum/discussion where I felt comfortable
   Improvement: maybe not even send out the paper/questions beforehand and have us develop experiments on the fly.
3. N/A