

Course evaluation template

After the course has ended, the course leader must fill in this template. The program director and education management will use your reflections to make adaptations to the program and/or the next time the course is given. The reflections will also be posted on the program web for students to read.

Course code 3GB015	Course title Non-communicable diseases, injuries, natural emergencies and conflicts in a global health perspective	Credits 3,0 hp
Semester HT24	Period 2025-01-27 – 2025-02-09	

Course leader Helena Nordenstedt	Examiner Helena Nordenstedt
Other participating teachers	Thais Lopes de Oliveira, Mary Barker, Lisa Dinkler (for examination seminar)

Number of registered students 47	Number who have not completed the course¹ 0	Number passed after regular session² 47
Methods for student influence other than course survey³ Teacher present every day of class. Open and fast email policy. Written anonymous evaluation last day in class (37/47 answered)		

¹At the time of completed grading and mandatory assignments/revisions.

²After first summative examination.

³State: how the students were given the opportunity to participate in the preparation and decisions at course level, how the students were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the course and how this forms the basis of the analysis and proposals below, response frequency (for example, concluding survey 70 % response frequency, post-it notes – improvement suggestions after the second course week 90 % response frequency, course council 85 % attendance).

Conclusions from the previous course evaluation

- In general the course seems to be well appreciated, despite the range of topics covered in a short time.
- Sessions in smaller groups with teacher is highly appreciated

Comments for next year:

- To again brief the lecturers more thoroughly on what has been brought up previously during the program (GBD, Best Buys, DALYs).
- Several students are continuously asking for the course to be one week longer, but since the program itself will now be prolonged, this will change from 2026.
- Ask lecturers to add even more practical examples, case scenarios and less theory.

- Possibly reduce the number of peer reviews to one instead of two

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

- The schedule was made slightly lighter.
- The course was fully in person, (except the lecturers joining from Uganda and France)
- The online lecture and Q&A with a Ugandan diabetes physician was continued
- The lecturers were briefed on basic concepts that they did not need to bring up, which resulted this time in some students asking for these to be brought up.
- The time for the journal club was kept somewhat reduced (from 3 to 2 hours, change done in 2022)
- The course still has only 2 weeks.
- Some more literature was added to Canvas.
- The NCD lecture at the start of the program was introduced as part of a general lecture on global burden of disease.
- The palliative care lecture was shortened again.
-

Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

In general the students seem satisfied with the course, with some things to improve. The general impression as portrayed by the question “I have developed valuable expertise during the course”, the mean this year was 4.1 (compared to 4.1 last year and 4.3 in 2023). On the question “the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning”, the students gave the course 4.4/5 (last year 4.4 and in 2023 4.7). Many questions received very similar mean mean this year as compared to last year. Also the question regarding how students felt the teachers were able to support your learning during the course, the mean was 4.6 (up from 4.6 last year and 4.7 in 2023) the same as for the question on how open teachers are to new ideas (4.6). The students seem content with the exam, which is in the form of a small essay called “Project proposal” (see below), with a mean of 4.4 (4.4 in 2024).

In the individual comments, also from the last day evaluation, a recurrent theme is that the students are asking for more than 2 weeks for the course, and also that all lectures (whenever possible) to be in person. Some are also asking to find ways to make more students attend lectures, which quite a few choose not to (the exam is not based directly on lectures since it is a written proposal). Many say that they very much enjoy the journal club, but would like to have one less peer review to do.

The course leader's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

This time around no students seemed discontent with overlap from previous lectures, which is a good thing.

To achieve the learning outcomes the course uses a mix of learning activities, ranging from lectures to role plays, journal clubs, examination seminar to online lectures with practitioners in low or lower-middle income countries. The students very much enjoy the learning activities in smaller groups, such as the role play in the NCD lecture and disaster lecture, the journal club and the examination seminars.

There are lectures to cover most of the learning outcomes, and then to dive deeper the same topics are covered again in another format such as a journal club.

The course is to cover a lot during two weeks, and to be able to examine all the learning outcomes the examination has been designed to cover at least 4 of the big NCD groups, and to make sure the students are exposed to all of them.

Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

- In general the course seems to be well appreciated, despite the range of topics covered in a short time.
- Results from course evaluation very similar to 2024
- Sessions in smaller groups with a teacher is highly appreciated

Comments for the 2-year program:

- Students continue to ask to have more than 2 weeks for NCDs and emergencies
- Ask lecturers to add even more practical examples, case scenarios and less theory.
- More mental health would be much appreciated.

Other comments