

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT  
FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN, NORWAY**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN HEALTH PROMOTION**

**STUDENT EVALUATION FOR HEPRO 301 (COMMUNICATIONS AND ETHICS)**

**LECTURERS:**

**Marguerite Daniel**

**Masego Katisi Thamuku**

**AUTUMN SEMESTER 2014**

**COMPILED BY:**

**Ernest Darkwah & Stand Hiestand**

**Class Representatives 2014/2016**

## 1. CONTENT

### Communication and ethics

Students had no problems with the content of the communications and ethics course and the personal teaching style of the lecturer. There was a general agreement that the lecturer did very well explaining concepts and theories. However, most students found the visiting scholars who came to give lectures quite difficult to understand and therefore less engaging.

## 2. TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS

### (Reading, Writing, Presentations, Feedback, Pair/Group Works, Workshops)

**General comment:** Some students suggested that there needs to be greater considerations of the teaching and learning methods that students are familiar with based on their backgrounds or home countries in order to make better judgments of what teaching methods to use, or to ease the transition. Also there was the suggestion that course outlines and required readings be sent out to admitted students in April or May before arrival so they could be much more prepared. This would also reduce the amount of stressful and confusing new information heaped on students during the first weeks of arrival.

- i. **Reading:** Some students felt that the readings should be given in a chronological order and not picked at random.
- ii. **Writing:** Some students complained that there were too many writing assignments, others felt that the syllabus was given early so the frequency of writing assignments was reasonable. Some students suggested that since written works are supposed to follow required ethical standards, lectures should be given on such standards before the assignment is given eg. ethics lectures should be given early on to guide writing assignments. Others would like the rubrics to be presented and explained much earlier. Some students were concerned that guidelines on how to do critical reviews and the ethics in writing came late, at a time when students had spent time writing what they thought was right only to realise from a later lecture that it was all substandard and had to be re-done. Also the view was expressed that PBLs and 301 assignments were too close so there was a lot of pressure trying to do PBL and write assignments simultaneously. The suggestion was that PBL and 301 submissions could be more staggered.
- iii. **Presentations:** There was a general sense of satisfaction with the presentations. However, some students were not aware of the opportunity to discuss potential topics with the lecturer before going ahead with the final presentation. Students suggested that such opportunities be well-publicized to make sure everyone is aware of it. A few students also felt the judgment/grading of presentations was subjective and potentially unfair. There was also concern about the amount of points to presentation. Some students think the points are too much for the presentation.

- iv. **Feedback:** Generally, students showed satisfaction with receiving feedback and commended lecturers for being detailed in especially face-to-face feedback. Students were especially pleased with the one-on-one feedback system after PBL. However there were concerns about the nature of feedback given on KARK. Students complained that the KARK feedback system is unable to point out exactly where errors appear or corrections need to be made in a submitted text. For example, the feedback is, at best, given at the end of each paragraph and some students felt that is inadequate in showing them exactly where they went wrong, for instance within a paragraph or where they could have done better. Students suggested that the system be modified such that detailed feedback could be given line-by-line where necessary. Some students also suggested that the opportunity should be given for draft assignments to be submitted for preliminary grading (which should **not** be included in the final grading) so that students will know the nature of work they have done before final submission.
- v. **Lectures and group/pair work in lectures:**  
There was general satisfaction with working in pairs and in groups during lectures.
- vi. **workshops:**  
Most students felt the time for workshops was too short and therefore made them unable to think through the texts presented. Some suggested the workshop time should be extended while others suggested separate slots on time table for just workshops. Some students also asked for instructions and expectations during workshops to be clearer.

### 3. OUTCOMES

#### a. Confidence in reading articles and academic writing:

Generally all students reported greater confidence and ability in reading and critically evaluating articles and texts. Students also said they now feel more confident in writing academically. However, some students feel there is more room for improvement. Others also said they are still not clear on how to apply socratic questioning during reading and writing of academic texts. Some students also complained that the issue of “there is no right or wrong answer” makes them confused as to why then some people get better grades than others.

#### b. Ability to present and give/receive feedback

Some students feel they are now better presenters, others feel there have been no improvements. One student observed that giving grades for feedback given by students could only motivate students to just talk for the sake of marks and not necessarily improve the quality of questions asked.

#### c. Knowledge about ethics and ethical procedures

In general, students reported being more aware of ethical principles (especially citations) in writing and how to use them.

#### **4. STRONGEST FEATURES OF THE COURSE AND TEACHING**

Students were of the view that teaching was realistic because real-life projects were discussed. Also most students commented that the presence of an African teacher helped them relate better to the experience. Students also felt that some of the strongest features of the teaching were that the primary lecturers were engaging, well-spoken, eloquent and very committed. Some students felt that the actual lecture was better than the workshops

#### **5. PACE OF THE COURSE**

Majority of the students (8 out of 12) felt that the pace was just right. The remaining 4 felt it was too fast.

#### **6. SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS:**

- KARK feedback should be more specific and highlight specific areas within submitted texts where a review is needed. The present system is too general.
- Students also suggested that rubrics for assignments and lectures on ethical standards be delivered early to guide students in their writing.
- More time and clearer instructions during workshops
- Some students suggested clearer explanations of the grading of presentations
- Some few students suggested that course outlines and reading lists be sent to admitted students before arrival
- One student suggested that student background be investigated before teaching methods are designed
- Opportunities for discussing presentation topics with lecturers before working on the solo presentation should be publicized well so students can take advantage.
- End-of-course evaluations: some students suggested that it should be done in the form of anonymous online surveys instead of reports compiled by class representatives from focus group discussions. The reason given for this was that, some students would not feel at ease to voice out the totality of their concerns in the presence of other course mates during focus group discussions.