Student evaluation of GLODE 301

(Critical Approaches to Global Development)

The course started on 14th August, and ended on 27th October with the submission of two essays (1000 words and 2500 words) for a portfolio assessment. The course included 12 double lectures, 9 seminars/workshops (including library courses), and six PBL sessions (including the presentation day). Of the four permanent GLODE staff who were involved in the course, two had joined UiB very recently.

The organization of the evaluation

The evaluation had a written and an oral part, and two hours were set aside for this. The students were given a questionnaire with open and closed questions and could decide for themselves whether they wanted to fill it in by hand, or digitally. Those who filled it in digitally were asked to send it to the class representative, who later sent all the responses to the course coordinator anonymously.

The questionnaire covered six themes: the lectures, Problem Based Learning (PBL), group work/interactive learning (other than PBL), the literature, feedback on written work and number of essays in the portfolio, as well as an open section for other viewpoints and recommendations for how the course can be improved. Under each of the themes, there were three to seven sub questions. The students who filled in the form in class spent approximately 45 minutes. After the written evaluation we had a discussion where the students' own viewpoints and comments were in focus.

Of the 22 students, only nine showed up, while six filled in the form later via MyUiB. In total, fourteen students (65%) participated in the written part, while nine (41%) took part in the oral part of the evaluation. The evaluation took place 2-3 days before the deadline for submission of the two course essays. This probably had a negative effect on participation.

Main findings

Overall, the students are very satisfied with the course. However, one student was very critical of the fact that there have been some administrative challenges (conflicting or wrong information), and also argued that the evaluation was done in an unprofessional way (since those students who did not show up in class but delivered their response through MyUiB could not do so anonymously).

The students come from very different backgrounds. Approximately half of them (11) have their backgrounds from low-income countries and have all of, or the greater part of, their education from their home country. While one of the students who have English as his/her mother tongue argued that the work load on the course had been very light, many others expressed that the literature was complicated, and that the assessment (writing essays) was a new thing to them. There is a also a gap between those who wish the course to be practical first of all, and those who are more academically oriented. One student suggested that there should be field visits to organizations/research institutes working on development issues, as well as welfare institutions like for example orphanages.

Several students argued that the lectures on gender and health promotion should have come earlier in the course, and not after the last essay assignment had been given.

Interactive learning

Several of the students argued that they wanted more time in class for discussions and practical examples. They found the discussions to be too rushed.

Two students noted that group work and discussions were sometimes dominated by one or two students. Two students also commented that it was sometimes hard for students from the North to contribute with examples based on their own experience/their home country.

As for the question whether group work should be done in class, or in the students' own time (in order to have more time for lectures), the respondents were divided 50-50. Half of the students answered that time should be given in class to do *both* group work and presentations, while the other half agreed that the students should meet in their own time to do the group work, and only do the presentations in class.

The students were by and large very enthusiastic about Problem Based Learning, but some mentioned that the work load was unevenly distributed within the groups. One student noted that the time that was allocated to each PBL session was too long, and that it would have been better with more and shorter sessions.

The literature

The evaluation revealed that the students only to a limited degree read the recommended course literature. A little more than half of the respondents, eight of the fourteen, answered that they read *some* of the literature for all the classes, five reported that they read *some* of the literature for *some* of the classes, while only *one* said that he/she had read *all* the recommended literature. The majority reported time pressure and/or economic constraints as reasons for not reading more. Some felt that the literature was too complicated, and one student felt that the recommended literature was not very relevant.

Some commented that the failure to read before class had a negative effect on group work, particularly in group work that involved two students only. One student suggested that groups should consist of 4-5 students to increase the chance that at least some of the participants were prepared for the discussion or group work. Another respondent suggested that the students themselves should present the recommended readings for each other in class, to ensure that everyone had read at least some of the recommended readings.

Written work

The students were generally very happy with receiving feedback on their annotations and they felt that this exercise helped them to get the reading done. They also highly appreciated the feedback that they received on their draft for essay 1. (In both cases, one or two students were not satisfied with the feedback he/she had received.) There was unanimous agreement that it was better to be assessed on the basis of two essays, rather than one (which was the case in 2016). However, many of the students felt that the assignment that was given for essay 2 was too wide/open, and that this made it hard to get started.

Suggested changes to the course (based on the student evaluation and the teacher's own judgement)

- The lectures on 'gender' and 'health promotion' should be moved to an earlier point in the course. They can for example swop places with the lectures on education, climate change, or migration and acculturation.

- The teachers should make efforts to explain that many of the problems that are discussed are relevant globally, not only in the South.
- The use of various forms of group work (including PBL) should be continued, and interactive learning methods should be further developed.
- Lecturers should try to find new ways to encourage students to read as much as possible of the recommended literature before class. This will make interactive learning more fruitful, and one will avoid a situation where students spend the time reading rather than writing after they have been given their essay assignment. One option is to ask the students to present articles/book chapters for the class.
- The number of articles/book chapters that the students write annotations from should be adjusted from around 120 pages (2017) to around 200, and the literature should be the same for all, to ensure a broad overview of the field and avoid early specialization. There should be at least one annotation from each theme. In order to avoid a high work load on the staff, one should consider whether the students can give comments to each other. A draw-back with this model is that the students are at very different academic levels.
- The assignments for the essays should not be too wide/open.
- The course evaluation should be done in a way that ensures full anonymity for all the respondents, not only those who attend the evaluation session in class.

Siri Lange
Course coordinator, GLODE301, autumn term 2017

Bergen 26.01.2017

Oppsummering av studentevaluering GLODE 302

Evalueringen forgikk ved hjelp av online-verktøyet Socrative. 20 av 23 aktive studenter møtte frem og deltok i evalueringen. Evalueringen fulgte samme opplegg som evalueringen vi gjorde høsten 2016

Vi hadde forberedt spørsmål om ulike grupper av forelesninger (de tre vitenskapsteoretiske introduksjonsforelesningene, forelesningene om kvalitative og kvantitative forskingsdesign, om kvalitet i forsking, om etikk og om aksjonsforskning), samt seminarer relatert til de respektive tema. Vi gjorde det slik at vi for hvert tema først hadde et multiple choice-spørsmål der studentene ble bedt om å gradere «usefulness». Dette spørsmålet ble, for hvert av temaene, etterfulgt av et «kvalitativt» spørsmål der de ble bedt om å elaborere/gi «further comments».

Vi bad også studentene evaluere de to obligatoriske innleveringene (om de var klart nok formulerte, vanskelighetsgrad, relevans for kurset og feedback). I tillegg ba vi dem evaluere kurslitteraturen, gi kommentarer til hva de synes var kursets sterkeste sider samt hva de tenker burde forbedres. Vi hadde også et åpent spørsmål der de kunne kommentere fritt, samt et spørsmål det de ble bedt om å gi en evaluering av egne innsats.

Til sammen besvarte studentene 21 spørsmål, og de brukte ca. 30 minutter på undersøkelsen.

Kurset får jevnt over gode evalueringer. De to innledningsforelesningene (i vitenskapsteori) samt forelesningene og seminarene om kvalitet i forsking og får særlig gode evalueringer (17 av 20 rangerer dem med høyeste score). Når det gjelder vitenskapsteorien så kommenter enkelte at den var krevende, men at den var godt forklart og nødvendig som grunnlag for forstå resten av kurset. Noen synes det ble litt mye informasjon fordelt på to forelesninger og at de kunne trengt mere tid til å fordøye stoffet. Forelesningene i forskningsdesign (kvantitative og kvalitative design) og i forskingsetikk får litt lavere score, men også disse blir vurdert som nyttige at et overveiende flertall av studentene. Når det gjelder forskingsdesign så er det noen studenter som synes at det ble vel my på kort tid, og foreslår at vi bruker med tid på dette. Kvantitative design var ifølge flere studenter mer utfordrende å forstå enn kvalitative. Dette var en tilbakemelding vi fikk også i fjor, og vi hadde derfor utvidet forelesningen om dette fra 2 til 4 timer fra høsten 2016. Uheldigvis fikk vi tildelt et dårlig og trangt lokale til denne undervisningsøkten; flere studenter kommentere naturlig nok på at det ble vanskelig å konsentrere seg. Etikkforelesningen får gjennomgående ros, men et par studenter kommentere at de synes det ble for enkelt/grunnleggende, - de har allerede vært gjennom temaet på tidligere studier og lærte ingenting nytt. Forelesningen og seminaret i Action research blir ikke rangert så veldig høyt (usefulness), men kommentarene fra studentene er likevel gjennomgående positive. (Diskrepansen mellom rangering og kvalitative evalueringer kan skyldes at en del ikke var tilstede på denne forelesningen). Også her etterspør noen studenter mer tid til temaet.

De to obligatoriske innleveringene får med noen få unntak gjennomgående ros for relevans og kvalitet og for relevant og detaljert feedback. Særlig innlevering 2 om forskningsdesign virker å ha engasjert studentene, men noen kommenterer på at ordlengden (1000 ord) var vanskelig å holde pga. omfanget av oppgaven. En student kommenterte på at tilbakemeldingen på oppgaven gitt fra de

andre studentene føltes irrelevant, fordi studentene - i motsetningen til læreren- ikke hadde lest oppgaven på forhånd men bare vært tilstede under presentasjonen av denne.

Seminaret tilknyttet innledningsforelesningene og seminarene om concepts and methods får noe mer blandet evaluering. Mange opplever dem som svært oppklarende og nyttige, men en del påpeker at de ikke synes de får nok ut av dem fordi ikke alle er godt forberedt eller at de ikke oppleves som å være «effektive» nok. Noen nevner at de ønsker informasjon om seminarene sendt ut tidligere slik at det blir bedre til forberedelse.

Når det gjelder kurslitteraturen så blir den godt evaluert av studentene. Stor sett blir den opplevd som tilgjengelig, men noen få studenter klager over vanskelighetsgraden når det gjelder de vitenskapsteoretiske tekstene. Kursets hovedbok (Punch) blir godt vurdert, men en student nevner at den er dyr, særlig tatt i betraktning av at de også må kjøpe en dyr lærebok for GLODE 301.

De fleste studenter er fornøyd med sin egen innsats ved kurset med noen innrømmer at de ikke har forberedt seg godt nok til undervisningen. Et par klager også på informasjon om gruppearbeid burde vært sendt ut tidligere slik at det ble bedre tid til forberedelse. En student uttrykker mangel på motivasjon for dette kurset. Når det gjelder kursets sterkeste sider samt forslag til forbedringer, så variere responsen veldig. Oppgaveinnleveringene og feedback på disse blir nevnt positivt av mange, mens studentene divergere når det gjelder forelesninger vs. seminar: Noen synes seminarene var det beste ved kurset, mens andre vil ha mer forelesninger og færre seminar.

Faglærers vurdering:

Alt i alt er jeg godt fornøyd med dette kurset. Kurset er bra integrert og vi får dekket de ulike læringsutbyttene på en rimelig god måte. Kurslitteraturen oppleves som relevant og stort sett tilgjengelig. Vi må likevel arbeide mer med innholdet i noen av seminarene slik at de gir bedre læringsutbytte, evt. utvikle dem til å bli en kombinasjon av mini-forelesning og aktiviteter. Det siste for å etterkomme ønsket til noen av studentene om mer lærerstyrt undervisning, men også for å gi selve presentasjonen av noen ulike tema (vitenskapsteori og forskningsdesign) noe mer tid. Vi kan også vurdere å utvide essayene med noen ord. Basert på studentevalueringene virker det som om studentene har større problemer med å tilegne seg kvantitativ metodologi enn kvalitativ metodologi. Etter å ha lest eksamensbesvarelsene må jeg si at det virker som om de aller fleste har fått et grep om det kvantitative, selv om de ved kursslutt gav utrykk for at det har vært vanskelig tilgjengelig. Uansett bør vi ha et ekstra fokus på tilgjengeliggjøring av kvantitative forskningsdesign og metoder for neste kull av studenter.

Emneansvarlig for 302

Haldis Haukanes

Egenvurdering av GLODE304 vår 2017

Den ansatte som hadde ansvaret for kurset GLODE304 våren 2017 sluttet i stillingen sin høsten 2017 og arbeider nå i utlandet.

Kurset ble gjennomført, men vi har ingen egenvurdering eller evaluering.

Self evaluation GLODE305 , spring 2017

I find that that overall the course has gone well; the group has in general been engaged and committed as have the teachers. The students' evaluations were very positive, commending both lectures in particular, bit also course readings and seminar activities. The students expressed a wish for more seminars, and here were also some concerns raised about the length of the course; they found the course quite intensive and would have wished for the course to stretch over a longer period of time. Planning the next course the wish for more seminar-activities will be taken into consideration. When it comes to the comments that the course should have been longer, I agree with that claim: 10 credits/6 weeks is not much to cover the basics of gender analysis in a global context. An enlargement of the course would mean a reorganization of the entire study programme. My suggestion would be that we run the whole programme one round (i.e. until spring 2018) and evaluate it in its entirety, before starting a potential process of reorganization.

Course evaluation GLODE306: Foundations of Health Promotion

Course responsible: Annegreet Wubs, Dept of Healt 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.

GLODE 307 Development Practice (10 ECTs)

Overall evaluation of module April 2017

GLODE 307 Development Practice

Learning outcomes

Knowledge:

The student has in-depth knowledge of:

- Development practice as the facilitation of collaboration across social sectors and across vested interests/values, at various social levels from community to society;
- The natures of 'community' Different perspectives on development practice, including human rights perspectives , gender perspectives, risk and resources perspectives and integral ecology approaches(equal attention to, and respect for, environmental, economic and social ecology)

Cultural aspects of development practice

Skills:

The student has the ability to

- Conduct community needs and assets mapping
- Negotiate: align, optimise and orchestrate diverging perspectives on community needs, priorities and resources (citizens', local officials', regional, national and global authorities')
- Communicate to colleagues and to community groups and representatives about methods and approaches to development practice
- Facilitate communities in developing, implementing and evaluating development strategies;
- Facilitate community-based participatory action research
- Locate particular development projects within local, national and global frameworks

Teaching methods

Teaching methods comprise lectures, group work and group presentations.

Compulsory assignments

Students are required to participate in group work doing action research with an organisation. The output of the group work is a report submitted to the organisation.

Assessment

Group presentation of findings and recommendations

Nineteen students were signed up for the course but one was not able to attend due to being refused permission to return to Norway from Ghana; he eventually withdrew from the course. It was compulsory to participate in group work and lectures were partially used for group work so the students could directly apply the techniques being taught to their group project (with partner organisations). In general attendance was good, but two or three students missed a number of lectures/group work sessions.

Contact time with students: Nine two-hour lectures; one two-hour tutored group work session; Presentation day (five hours) with five group presentations of group work in collaboration with a partner organisation

Staff feedback on draft group reports (verbal and written).

Marguerite arranged the collaboration with organisations and taught most of the topics, but Gloria and Maurice taught two lectures each. Presentation day was attended by Haldis, Gloria and Marguerite; the contact person for each organisation attended the relevant presentation.

All students passed the course.

Student evaluation

Course content: In general the students enjoyed the course content, found it interesting, comprehensive, useful and well-structured. One student commented: "Especially liked the emphasis on local empowerment and understanding before implementing a project". However another student commented: "The content was more about practice 'out there' in the real world rather than for small projects like we were doing".

Teaching methods: The lectures were generally enjoyed with comments about the interesting topics and engaging teaching. Maurice Mittelmark was singled out as excellent by two students. However one student thought the course was top-down and would have liked more student participation. The group work was also generally enjoyed with several students seeing it as an opportunity to practice skills. Three students commented on the usefulness of the interaction between the lectures and the group work.

Most students mentioned the strongest feature of the course as being the work with real organisations and real people: understanding things we have learned, putting them into practice, hands-on experience. One student said this: "I really enjoyed the lectures and was introduced to several things I can imagine myself using both as a researcher and practitioner. I feel more prepared for actually working in the development sector!"

Working with an organisation: In some cases the students found it hard to make the initial contact with the organisation and were uncomfortable sending several emails. Regarding contact with organisations or ethical questions, the students felt they had help and support from GLODE staff. Many students struggled with perceived lack of support from the organisation. There was a lot of waiting, and with a project with a limited time frame, many felt stressed when the organisations took their time to reply. Misunderstandings also led to delays. Over all this was a good first step in terms of working "for real". Facing the challenges regarding communication was a real life learning experience. Many students also mentioned that it was nice to practice research methods, like participant observation and interviewing. When working with real organisations, the students felt like it mattered more, which made us work harder, and in the end be even more proud of the outcome. The students are in general very positive to GLODE 307 as a course, but it may be an idea to inform the organisations more beforehand in terms of time schedule and what is expected of them, as well as the students.

Suggestions for improvements were very fragmented, but included issues about timing – e.g. we should do this course *AFTER* the methodology course so that we have the knowledge to do the task; the report writing session should come much earlier on, the week without lectures should come later on, etc. Other suggestions included to have more examples of actual development practice, to find more appropriate organisations, to make this a bigger course with more time and credits, etc.

Time allocation: The class was divided on the appropriateness of the time allocation. Some felt there was enough time for the group work and they received the information they needed when they needed it. But others felt they were under pressure with insufficient time to meet the stakeholders or build relationships with them; also there was knowledge they needed and received too late (like evaluation techniques).

Staff evaluation

(by Gloria and Marguerite)

What went well?

The **group project**, the practical application of much of what was taught, was the best feature of the course. The lectures could relate directly to the group work. Setting up the projects with the organisations took a lot of time and personal visits in some cases. There were also unavoidable changes along the way (reflected in the students' comments that the organisations could be better informed!). The effort was worthwhile and the projects were all based on genuine issues which really engaged the students.

Having a **real live practitioner** (Gloria!!) was a major asset and greatly enhanced the authenticity of the course.

It is worthwhile taking time to **set up the groups** and projects, but in future we recommend that no project deals with youth under the age of 18 (for ethical reasons it was hard to recruit them as stakeholders). The groups were balanced according to these criteria: men and Norwegian speakers spread between the groups; stronger and weaker students balanced. Students were given the option of switching – but they would have to find a 'like' person to switch with, e.g. same sex and ability in Norwegian. As there are a number of foreign students, some of them lacked confidence to advise Norwegian organisations – we stressed that *everyone* is a resource in terms of experience and knowledge

Presentation day with the attendance of the contact person at each organisation was a great success. The students excelled – the content and presentations demonstrated just how much the students have matured since they started the course eight months ago. Their PBL experience showed in the way they tackled and solved the problems – and the final presentations.

What could have gone better?

1. We agree with some of the things the students suggested about **timing**: It would be best if the students had completed the methods course before doing this course; the week free of lectures should come later – we suggest a logical order below. We disagree with the students about the timing of the report-writing session – it should not come right near the beginning (we fear that might skew their research), but perhaps 10 days before they submit their draft report
   Suggested order: Introduction, stakeholders and mobilisation, evaluation methods, approaches (practical) & frameworks (logframes/ theory of change) … i.e. the tools and concepts the students need in their group work

Followed by the broader approaches like gender, HR, risk & resources, culture and integral ecology, accountability & report writing

2. The group work component of the course is compulsory and the lectures actually contained a great deal of group work (with students literally working in their project groups) to apply concepts immediately. Some students missed a lot of 'lectures' – and therefore also group work. If we rename the contact-time with the students as '**workshops**' with instruction it will change the way students view the contact time – and the way we plan our teaching (for the better we hope!). Only the introduction needs to be a lecture, all other topics can be included in 'workshop' with instruction

Other comments – we did not ask the students about the **literature**, but feel that it was entirely appropriate for the course. Many of the articles came from journals like "Development and Practice". Maurice commended us on the reading list!

Evaluation by organisations

The contact persons for the organisations gave very positive feedback during the presentations, but have not yet responded to the email questions sent out on 20 April.

1. How was the collaboration useful to you?
2. How was it a burden? What could have improved the collaboration for you?
3. Was communication with the course leader sufficient in terms of
    a. Information
    b. Frequency
4. Would you be willing to collaborate with us again? (Yes/ Yes, but not next year/ No)
5. Any other comments?