

Course evaluation GLODE306: Foundations of Health Promotion

Course responsible: Annegreet Wubs, Dept of Health Promotion and Development

Introduction: This was a new course taught for the first time in spring 2017. It is the specialization course in Health Promotion in the Master's study Global Development Theory and Practice at the Department of Health Promotion and Development. The students select and specialize in Health Promotion, and will write their Master's thesis in the field of Health Promotion.

Teacher's evaluation:

Teaching- and examination format: The teaching was organized in two days a week, with lectures and PBL sessions. Ten students took the course, divided in two PBL groups. Annotations of 100 pages of literature were a compulsory part of the course. Attendance of 80% of the PBL sessions was also a compulsory requirement for being allowed to proceed to the exam. The exam was in the form of a home exam consisting of 3000 words. All 10 students took the exam, but 1 failed to deliver due to illness. The grades ranged from A-E, with A(2), B(1), C(4), D(1), E(1), an average of C.

Literature list: The literature list was satisfactory and consisted of a mix of books, articles, book chapters, WHO documents etc divided according to topic.

Student's assessment and feedback:

Method: Socrative.com questionnaire, 19 closed and open questions, students filled out answers in the classroom on their smart phones without the staff being present. It took about 25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Nine out of 10 students filled out the questionnaire, one failed to fill it out because of being overseas. Some of the 9 students indicated they had not attended one or more of the lectures. Students were asked to respond to questions on how useful they found each lecture. Answer categories to all closed questions were: Not useful, Somewhat useful, Very useful or Did not attend.

The evaluation showed that in general the lectures were very positively rated, most students found lectures very useful, only seldom a lecture would get a 'not useful' indication. However, for one lecture in particular students were not univocally positive, the 4 hour Salutogenesis lecture with Eva Langeland that was organized together with HEFR342. Although half the class found it very useful, others has critique that there was too much repetition from the literature they had read beforehand, some found it too long and repetitive, and they would have liked the lecturer to delve deeper into the subject. For next year we may look into changing the content and organization of that particular lecture. Other than that, the lectures by Maurice Mittelmark were especially appreciated by the students. And the lecture on the SHINE project by Sheri Bastien was very positively evaluated as well, to have a real-life example of a project was considered very useful and inspiring. One or two students

mentioned that for some lectures, the suggested literature for the lecture was quite identical to the content of the lecture itself. This was quite frustrating for those students who had prepared thoroughly, and would have liked more in-depth discussion of the topic at hand.

With regard to PBL, the feelings about this teaching style are mixed: half the class is very enthusiastic about using PBL to gain knowledge, while others have critique that the process can be slow when not all group members contribute equally, and working in a group vs. individual work sometimes causes frustrations. Still, all said that in the end they learned a lot from the PBL sessions, and they were very happy with their end product (the presentation for the class).

The literature list was positively evaluated with regard to content, students felt through the readings they had gotten a thorough introduction to health promotion. Some complained about the number of pages that were required to be read, although the number of pages were in line with UiB requirements for a 10 ECTS course.

With regard to the planning of the course, some students suggested making the course a little longer, so that more topics could be covered in depth.

Teacher's overall evaluation and suggestions for change:

Overall the lecturers felt that the course went well and in line with the learning objectives, and that those students who took full advantage of the resources provided benefitted most of the course. However there is room for improvement and the following are suggested:

The feeling that the course could be longer is shared with the staff in GLODE, our recommendation is that the specialization courses will last 1-2 weeks longer to make sure this important part of the study is covered well enough.

The lecture on salutogenesis by Eva Langeland could be re-organised next year, so that the content does not repeat the theory that students have already read beforehand, but that the focus is more on practical examples on how to apply salutogenesis in practice.

In general care should be taken that there the lectures are a balance between presentation of the theory and a too big overlap with the readings beforehand. Lectures could go deeper into the subject at hand and apply knowledge for example, employing interactive elements in the lectures.

Although not all students prefer to work with PBL, we still feel it is a useful and important way for students to gain knowledge, while increasing their independent research skills, organizational skills and learn to collaborate with a variety of people. Since we do not employ PBL methods in all aspects of our study, it might make it a bit harder for the students to get in and out of the PBL method from one course to the next. We could look into this and see if there is a need for use of more PBL throughout the entire study. At least for GLODE306, next year we could add 2 PBL sessions so that the students are given more time to work on the problem in their groups.

The number of pages for the literature list were in accordance to the guidelines and we do not feel this needs adjustment.