



Course evaluation template

After the course has ended, the course coordinator fills in this template. The head of department/programme decides whether the template should be supplemented with further information/questions.

Course code 3GB12	Course title Degree Project in Global Health	Credits 30
Semester VT20	Period February – June 2020	

Course coordinator Martin Gerdin Wärnberg and Asli Kulane	Examiner Martin Gerdin Wärnberg and Asli Kulane
Other participating teachers Two teachers per student are grading the theses	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 36	Number who have not completed the course 2	Number passed after regular session 34
--	--	--

Conclusions from the previous course evaluation

- Continue to improve the digital support systems for submitting project proposals by prospective supervisors, thesis templates, and thesis grading.
- Improve how project opportunities are presented to the students. Based on the course evaluation we would like to make opportunities available to the students earlier during the fall and as they are submitted to us, rather than compiling them into a list before publishing them for students to see.
- Most importantly we need to mobilize more global health researchers to submit more project proposals to the global health students. Mobilization of projects should start in late August and be followed up with personal contacts with the research groups at the department with global health relevant topics.
- We will encourage main supervisors to identify a co-supervisor in order to broaden the skill set in the team around each student.
- We will modify the contract between supervisor(s) and student to clarify how the team will support the student on matters in relation to: content, method, context, process of the thesis, financing issues for students traveling, forms of communication and the working environment of the student abroad and/or in Stockholm. Through this checklist of questions to discuss during the first meetings between supervisor and student we anticipate better working relationships.
- We also would like to make it mandatory for co-grading teachers (examiners) to review at least two theses to improve their understanding of the level of the theses overall.



- An additional priority area is to improve the recruitment of co-grading teachers, by for example reaching out earlier during the semester.

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

This semester was the first semester with the course 100% in Canvas. Overall this worked well, but with some challenges. Since the previous course occasion we:

- Made the project proposals available to students as they were submitted.
- Made an attempt to semi-automate the process of submitting project proposals so that they were submitted by researchers and then published on Canvas with minimal manual input from the course coordinators. This was overall successful but because of technical difficulties in integrating different KI systems (in this case KI survey and Canvas) more work needs to be done.
- Updated, created and posted templates for all submissions on Canvas. This was done during the course.
- We reached out to potential supervisors early.
- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic a majority of the course was completed remotely.
- We attempted to enforce a two thesis policy in the examination process

Method(s) for student influence

We gave students opportunities to participate in the preparation and decisions at course level and also provided verbal feedback continuously during the course. We have been in contact with many students over email/Canvas on specific questions or concerns they had. These contacts have served as a good indicator of the level of progress in learning outcomes for some of the students and provided an opportunity for students to give us feedback on the clarity or lack thereof of guidelines and instructions.

Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

Our response rate to the course valuation this year was over 82%, which is almost double compared to the previous course occasion. We are very happy about this increased interest in providing valuable feedback to us as course leaders. Overall the responses that we got were positive. A clear majority (~90%) of responding students felt that they had developed valuable expertise/skills and achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course to a large or very large degree. They felt that there was a common theme running throughout the course and that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning. A majority felt that we were open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content to a large or very large extent. Excitingly, 17 responding students provided suggestions on how to improve the course. These suggestions focused mainly on the examination process and input from thesis supervisors.

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

It is up to the students to choose their degree project in this course and they may therefore do so based both on the knowledge, experiences and prerequisites that they bring to the master programme and that they acquire during the courses preceding the degree writing course. This is a considerable strength because it allows us and the students to capitalize on a substantial knowledge base instead of starting from scratch. It does however also mean that the process is to a large extent student driven, which does not benefit weaker students.



The process of selecting a master thesis looks quite different among the students. For around half of the students it appears relatively straightforward and by early November they are set in a project. For the other half of students a number of different challenges have been noted: Some students feel unprepared to select a project in early fall and are not contacting supervisors; some want a perfect match of country, topic and methodology and wait out for this opportunity; some are interested in topics where supervisors at KI are scarce; some lose time by waiting on slow or negative responses from prospective supervisors or from funders of travel expenses. At the end of the process, the far majority of students ended up with projects they seemed satisfied with. Establishing good working relationships with their supervisor teams was accomplished for almost all students. However, the process of identifying/selecting a project should be shortened in time and effort.

The course's learning outcomes are centred around understanding the scientific process involved in moving from a research question to a final thesis product. Our methods focus on supporting the students' own scientific process. We attempt to provide ample opportunities for the students to present their thoughts, plans and progress for their peers and us course leaders and also get individual feedback.

The examination is designed in such a way that the form and content are familiar to the students. The submission of the seminar version, followed by a preliminary assessment by examiners after which students revised and finally submitted a final version to be graded, aligns very well with the intended learning outcomes of the course. During this year's examination seminars, the vast majority of students received comments of improvements to reach the pass level.

The relationship between student and supervisor is very important for the progression of learning of the student. There are many advantages of having a co-supervisor in order to give support on methods, content, study context and the process of the thesis writing. As we noted last year we should encourage more supervisors to have co-supervisors.

The level of ambition is high for many students and supervisors. We should re-emphasize to supervisors that their engagement in supervision should be based in an interest in supporting student's learning process and to complete the thesis. Opportunity of publication of results should be discussed only thereafter to prevent that students are considered as research assistants.

The students that are offered a working space at the location of the supervisor have expressed a high appreciation of this including many advantages for their learning when participating in research group activities. We should more explicitly encourage supervisors to consider this option.

Description of how the course works with quality, research-basis and collaboration with other professions

All GPH faculty were contacted early in the fall term of 2019 to identify and develop potential master thesis projects for students which fall within their current research. The integration of the master thesis project into an existing research group and project provides the most conducive environment for the students to develop their skills and knowledge. We have personal communications with the prospective supervisors to secure the quality and



suitability of the thesis project on a need basis. Inter-professional, inter-disciplinary and international composition of the supervisory team is supported.

All thesis projects are posted on Canvas as they are received, and students are to contact the supervisors directly. This process makes the matching of students and project as transparent as possible and is a way to give equal opportunity to all students. As course coordinators we do not recommend individual students to specific supervisors.

Already during the month of September, we met the students and introduced the process of the thesis writing course. The students had the opportunity to ask questions to better understand the process here at KI. During this first encounter we described the different resources they have at their disposal, but we also described some of the more tacit practices in Swedish academia, such as sending reminders to researchers who might not answer their emails within a weeks' time.

Course leader meetings within the MGH program during the academic year offer an opportunity for us as course leaders to discuss student progression of intended learning outcomes in the program. The course leader collaboration within the MGH program could be strengthened through providing more feedback from our course to the course leaders on methodological or other dilemmas.

Course coordinator's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

- Continue to improve the digital support systems for submitting project proposals by prospective supervisors and thesis grading. The current system of emailing word templates for grading should be replaced by a system more integrated in Canvas.
- Further automate the process of submitting project proposals and presenting these to students.
- Most importantly we need to mobilize more global health researchers to submit more project proposals to the global health students. Mobilization of projects should start in late August and be followed up with personal contacts with the research groups at the department with global health relevant topics.
- Encourage main supervisors to identify a co-supervisor in order to broaden the skill set in the team around each student.
- Modify the contract between supervisor(s) and student to clarify how the team will support the student on matters in relation to: content, method, context, process of the thesis, financing issues for students traveling, forms of communication and the working environment of the student abroad and/or in Stockholm. Through this checklist of questions to discuss during the first meetings between supervisor and student we anticipate better working relationships.
- Make it mandatory for co-grading teachers (examiners) to review at least two theses to improve their understanding of the level of the theses overall.
- An additional priority area is to improve the recruitment of co-grading teachers, by for example reaching out earlier during the semester.
- Several students expressed concerns about an unfair examination process. Therefore important areas for improvement are to better explain the process, including the two stages of assessment and the high frequency of students that will be required to revise the thesis before it can pass, early on in the course, and to provide more clear information to examiners.



Views on the course and improvement suggestions from others

na

Description of how the course valuation has provided feedback internally and to the students

The course evaluation has been presented to the students on the course web.

Tilläggsfrågor till kursledarreflektioner (på engelska):

Indicator	# of hours	Rationale
STUDENT/LECTURER:		
Number of contact hours in total		
Of which:		
(i) Number of hours lead by lecturer		
(ii) Number of hours for student interaction/group work/peer review etc.		
COURSE LEADER:		
Number of hours that you as a course leader have spent with the students		
Number of hours that you as course leader have spent on your pedagogical development before, during, after the course		



Pedagogical skills that you would like to improve		
--	--	--

Make a table of your Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) as formulated in the syllabus and identify the ILOs that were mainly met through lectures.

Reflect on the type and level of student participation during the course. When were most/least students present in the classroom? How do you interpret that? Were you helped to understand this through the student valuation? If yes, please describe how. If no, please suggest alternative ways of getting this information.

Attach your final schedule to the reflections. Comment on any changes made during the course and the reasons.