



## 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.

<b>Course code</b>  4FH097	<b>Course title</b> Applied health promotion and prevention	<b>Credits</b> 10 hp
<b>Semester</b> HT21	<b>Period</b> 20211130–20220114	

<b>Course leader</b> Ann Liljas	<b>Examiner</b> Ann Liljas
<b>Other participating teachers</b>	<b>Other participating teachers</b>

<b>Number of registered students</b> 21	<b>Number who have not completed the course<sup>1</sup></b> 0	<b>Number passed after regular session<sup>2</sup></b> 21
<b>Methods for student influence other than course survey<sup>3</sup></b> The students we given the opportunity to choose preferred dates and either morning or afternoon session for the two peer support sessions (everyone got at least one of the dates and times asked for). An online anonymous feedback channel was set up and available from the first day of the course for students to provide any feedback. Students were also regularly encouraged to email and speak to the course leader on how the course could be adapted and improved. Changes such as new group allocations and providing online opportunities were undertaken during the course to meet the students' requests and needs.		

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

<sup>2</sup> After first summative examination.

<sup>3</sup> State: 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

*Insert reflections from previous course evaluation.*

Overall, I am happy with the course. It was good to run most sessions myself to realise what the students like and need, and to ensure that there is a focus on how public health is applied including making sure models and concepts such as process evaluation are presented and discussed. Also, I am very impressed by the students' knowledge and skills and they were very friendly too. The covid19 pandemic did create a few technical challenges of which the first suggestion for improvement is related to.

- I totally agree with the students that there were technical issues too many times including some that I might have been able to avoid and am currently trying to learn more about to prevent in the future e.g. issues with Zoom. I also agree that it is annoying when the projector isn't working despite restarting everything and then having to get IT to help.
- Refine examination criteria by adding 'excessive ability to write independently and to make reasoning' to pass with distinction, and grade the final oral examination to facilitate the marking and justification of a certain grade.



- Incorporate the suggestions by the students (which were all really good) including to do a workshop where the students get to develop, present and discuss a health promotion intervention – and to have this quite early in the course as one student suggested they need to learn more about how to develop, implement and evaluate interventions prior to analysing an intervention on their own, reduce the time spent on the HomeHealth intervention, invite more health promotion practitioners ideally researchers and examples of public health experts who have undertaken interventions/work in developing countries, move the public health debate session to earlier in the course, swap the two peer support sessions so that the first one is an oral presentation (and run it over two days as time was very limited) and the second support session to be about the written work, and, as suggested in the evaluation I will develop a checklist for choosing an intervention for the course assignment.

## Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

### Summary of the students' response to the course evaluation

The students' responses indicate that they were very happy with the course; they enjoyed the wide range of topics covered and the fact that I had asked some of the non-academic presenters to share what their career paths have involved. The variety of teaching methods used was appreciated and several students reported that they were given the opportunity to provide feedback during the course and that they received the support needed to complete the course.

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

As the course leader I have great responsibility in ensuring that the course meets the students' expectations and runs smoothly. Prior to the start of the course, I read through my notes from last year and made changes to the course in accordance with the suggestions given by the former students. This turned out very well as former students' suggestions such as organizing workshops and having the oral peer support session before the written peer support session were well-received and considered useful. An advantage this year is also that I lectured and facilitated the weekly group sessions (4 sessions in total) in the HPP-specific course that is held two months before the Applied Health Promotion and Prevention course started. This meant that the students and I knew each other at the start of this course. I also knew to a greater extent what had been covered in the course "Theories and methods for implementation and evaluation", making it easier to refer back to specific sessions where they had learnt e.g. certain theories, models and frameworks.

New learning activities such as the two workshops were closely linked to multiple learning outcomes ranging from identifying a public health problem and assessing and applying relevant theories, models and/or frameworks, to reasoning about the intervention's scale-up potential and propose improvements. Thus, the added learning activities did most likely contribute to the students attaining the learning outcomes.

In terms of applying constructive alignment from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content, such alignment was also linked to the two workshops and supported by the lectures and activities throughout the course. For instance, the main part of the examination was an individual task in written and at an early stage the students were given the task to practice scientific writing by writing a Letter to the Editor.

The Covid-19 pandemic has resulted in multiple changes from on-site to online sessions and this is tiresome for everyone involved. The good thing is that I had planned for online sessions prior to and just after the self-study period as I thought some students might go abroad. Due to increased infection rates the online teaching had to be extended, with short notice, to include more and more sessions and finally it was extended to the end of the course as over 25% of students were in quarantine by then yet healthy enough to participate online. This had, of course, a negative impact on the quality of sessions such as the public health debate and the final verbal presentations.

### Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

First, I would like to thank the students for completing the evaluation form and for providing useful suggestions for improvement. I think the suggestions provided are fair and useful. In particular, I have taken the following suggestions related to the peer support sessions and final presentations into consideration for next year.

- 1) One student thought that the peer support sessions were too close to each other timewise. This is a good point and when planning I thought it would be stressful for some having the second session too close to Christmas. Next year I will ensure that there will be more time between the peer support sessions. The same student also suggested that the same groups should kept for both sessions to avoid repetition. I think this suggestion makes sense and I will try this next year. The reason students were mixed is because they were given the opportunity to indicate preferred date and time for each of the two sessions which resulted in different groups. Last year the students thought it would have been useful to group them after topic or method used however that option had to be balanced against the opportunity of attending at a certain date and time. To find out about other students' topic and method all students were asked to attend everyone's final presentation.



- 2) For the final presentations (which, with very short notice, had to be online) I agree with the students who have commented on this that each student should be allocated to ask questions on a specific other presentation. This was applied to the peer support sessions that were undertaken in smaller groups and I should have done the same for the final presentations to make the discussion more active. This will definitely be implemented next year. Some further suggested that the final presentations should be in smaller groups as it is hard to stay active during the two days (instead each student should read all group members' assignments and prepare questions for everyone in their group). I think it can also be useful to listen to the others too (see comment 1 above), yet I will consider this suggestion.

### **Other comments**

Not applicable.