

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

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN HEALTH PROMOTION**

**STUDENT EVALUATION FOR HEPRO 300  
(INTRODUCTION TO HEALTH PROMOTION)**

**LECTURERS:**

**Marguerite Daniel**

**Masego Katisi Thamuku**

**AUTUMN SEMESTER 2014**

**COMPILED BY:**

**Ernest Darkwah & Stand Hiestand**

**Class Representatives 2014/2016**

**1. CONTENT**

### **1. “Crash course” immediately after reading week (Ottawa Charter action areas)**

Some students felt the crash course was alright in general but could have fostered more understanding if additional case studies or practical examples were given. Other students felt the practical examples were sufficient. In general, students are having difficulties remembering the specifics of the lectures, which were several months ago.

### **2. Other lectures (empowerment, social determinants, salutogenesis, cultural perspectives, gender perspective and the international perspective)**

The Salutogenesis lecture was considered more general with less practical examples by select students. Some students want more practical examples of salutogenesis in HP research. Some examples given in the salutogenesis lecture confused some students. Most students felt fine with the lectures and practical examples given in most of the topics such as empowerment, gender perspectives. One student mentioned that one action area (re-orienting health services) was not addressed. Nearly the entire class didn't understand the purpose of the international perspectives lecture.

### **3. Is there anything you felt was missing, that you would have liked a lecture on?**

Here are some suggestions made by the students:

- A lecture on re-orienting health services would have helped clarify the practicalities in HP.
- A lecture on the Norwegian health care system
- A lecture on the place of HP in Norway

## **2. THE TEACHING & LEARNING METHODS USED**

### **A. Reading week and annotations**

*Reading week:* Many students found it stressful. Some felt like it was just there to occupy the students while the lecturers were absent. The timing of the reading week was not ideal for some students. There was also a suggestion that another reading week be given for the annotations in HEPRO 302.

*Annotations:* Some students felt that the guidelines for the first annotations were not clear enough, writing them was therefore stressful. However, after the 10 annotations were submitted and reviewed, many students ultimately felt clear on what was expected. Some students still think that clearer instructions need to be given concerning annotations in general because people still have questions regarding pending annotations in HEPRO302.

## **B. Lectures and group/pair work in lectures**

During the lectures some students were confused about what they were supposed to do in the group and pair work.

## **C. PBL**

Most students thought PBL was fine. Some students, however, would have liked a break between the first and the 2nd PBLs. They would have preferred a longer break between the two PBLs to allow for more time for working on HEPRO301 assignments.

Additionally, there was the suggestion that the presence of tutors at all times in PBL somewhat restricted student freedom and opinions. The suggestion was made that tutors could be present for the first half of each PBL session only. Some also found it stressful for the tutor to be present constantly - especially when the tutor is an authority figure.

Some students felt post PBL activities were too much. Having to write up a reflection and then do a one-on-one feedback on it again felt burdensome.

Some students were confused about some of the terms on the evaluation form (such as “feedback”). Other students were confused about how to use evaluation forms. More instruction is considered necessary if these evaluation forms are to be used in the future. The evaluation forms caused a lot of debate in this student discussion.

## **D. Module paper**

The examples given from past students were assumed to be the best papers turned in, and when using them as an example of expectations some students felt their drafts matched the quality and were similar in content to the examples. These students were therefore confused and frustrated when feedback from the draft indicated a misunderstanding of expectations. It made some people wonder whether the samples given were the best guides.

Also, some students reported confusion with the entire format and the exact expectations of lecturers regarding the module paper (a specific example was lack of emphasis on critical reflection in the instruction).

Some students felt feedback on the drafts came late, others were fine with feedback timing.

# **3. THE OUTCOME**

## **A. A solid knowledge foundation in health promotion**

Generally students feel that their foundation in HP is sufficient.

## **B. Ability to work collaboratively in groups to solve problems**

Students feel confident with their ability to work collaboratively with groups.

Some students felt their past experience was already sufficient for group work.

**C. Ability to read and reflect critically**

Most students felt that their ability to read and reflect critically has generally improved.

**D. Ability to write a scholarly paper**

Most students felt that their ability has improved.

**4. WHAT ARE THE STRONGEST FEATURES OF THIS COURSE? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT CONTRIBUTES MOST TO YOUR LEARNING?**

Some students felt PBL was very helpful.

Students commented that the lectures in general were clear.

One student mentioned the Strengthening Community Action lecture specifically.

**5. WHAT SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR CHANGES THAT SHOULD HAVE BE MADE TO IMPROVE THE COURSE OR HOW IT IS TAUGHT?**

Some student suggestions include:

- Getting rid of the PBL evaluation form.
- Adding a break between PBL sessions.
- Reducing tutor presence in PBL.
  - Providing clearer instructions for annotations before the first 10 annotations are submitted.
- Some students suggested adding more practical examples to lectures, others believe the practical examples are sufficient as they are now.
- Adding a lecture on re-orienting health services.
- Adding lectures on health promotion planning. Students felt the coverage on this topic was insufficient, but they believe it is a core aspect of HP that needed to be dealt with in class.

**6. PACE OF THE COURSE**

The majority (6 or 12) felt the pace was just right. Three felt the pace was too fast. Mangali was absent. Two felt the pace was too slow.

**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.



**UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN**  
**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN HEALTH PROMOTION**

**REPORT ON STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF HEPRO 302 : INTRODUCTION TO  
RESEARCH METHODS**

**Compiled by:**

**Ernest Darkwah & Stand Hiestand (Class Representatives, 2014 – 2016)**

**January, 2015**

## CONTENT

### A. Different approaches to research

All students were satisfied with the information presented through lectures and the textbook on the different approaches to research.

### B. Research Design

Most students were also satisfied with explanations on research design. One student however suggested that more time and lectures on quantitative designs would have been helpful as there was only one lecture on quantitative techniques. Others were also interested in the option of allowing students to be trained in both quantitative and qualitative research instead of having to select one or the other.

### C. The Creswell book

Generally, students liked Creswell. There was one suggestion that online versions of such books could be made available to students.

### D. The teaching & learning methods used

#### *i. Lectures*

Overall, students felt the lecturers for this course were effective. One student found the quantitative lecture more interesting than the qualitative

#### *ii. Annotations*

Students were fine with annotations. Comments were made that previous experiences with annotation writing in HEPRO 300 helped make annotation for this course easier.

#### *iii. Group work*

Students generally showed dissatisfaction with the group work especially regarding the grading. One student said: “The class was told that group work for this course was not PBL ⇒ were they using the rubric for PBL in assessing individual performances?”

Several students want an explanation of the differences in the marks that were given within the group. They didn’t understand the criteria for getting different marks, and they felt the criteria were not explained to them, and that the grades given were unjust.

## THE EXAM

Students were generally satisfied with the exam. Some however felt that five lines for answers were too short especially when there were some questions that called for multiple answers. Other

students also felt that the weight given the exam in the total grade mark (30%) was too small, but majority felt it was reasonable.

## **THE OUTCOME**

### **A. Knowledge**

Some students felt they had been adequately introduced to research methods. Most felt they came away with appropriate knowledge of the course.

### **B. Competencies**

Students agreed that they have acquired significant knowledge and feel able to apply such knowledge in real-life situations. One student felt the class is gradually growing into “Salutogenic Babies”.

## **STRONGEST FEATURES OF THE COURSE**

Maurice’s lectures were specifically noted as especially helpful (both action research and the first “practical” lecture). Creswell was also appreciated by many students as easy to understand and contributing to their learning. The quantitative lecturer, Robert Smith, was also valued and several students would have liked for him to lecture longer or more than once.

## **SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The following are suggestions made by students:

- i. Opportunity should be given for students to take both quantitative and qualitative training (Or, there should be a mixed methods class offered)
- ii. There should be a considerable time break between courses. Some students complained feeling exhausted from switching from one course to another without any break in between
- iii. Robert Smith should be given more slots on the timetable to teach quantitative research

## **THE PACE OF THE COURSE:**

Everyone said the pace was just right.

## **NB:**

Students are requesting a meeting with the course officials for an explanation to the issues raised concerning the grading of the group work.