GLODE311 three-year course evaluation (2024, 2025, 2026)

Course responsible: Helga Bjørnøy Urke (2024), Hilde Sjøbø Asbjørnsen with support from Helga Bjørnøy Urke (2025), Siri Lange (2026)

Year and semester of three-year evaluation: Spring 2026 (written up in August)

Brief summary of the course

The course is a 15-credit course which "introduces students to the Development Practice arena first and foremost as a field of practice, but also as a research subject and as the object of critical scholarship" (https://www4.uib.no/studier/emner/glode311)

The is run in the spring semester of the 1st year of the Master study, and follows GLODE 300, Critical Approaches to Development, specialization courses (where the students have taken either 308 Gender in Development or 309 Health promotion), and methods courses (where the students have taken either HEM303 Qualitative Methods or HEM304 Quantitative Methods).

During the course, the students work in groups and write a commissioned report on a topic that a civil society organisation (CSOs) or public institution in Bergen has identified.

The course is taught as a combination of lectures and seminars where the students work on their reports. The students also have one or more meetings with the organization, and most groups do interviews or conduct a small survey.

The course leader set up the groups. Each group has four to five members and include students from both specialisations (gender and health promotion), and ideally both qual and quant students (but in 2026 only one student had taken the quantitative methods course). In 2026, Red Cross Hordaland suggested that students that had been accepted to have their internship with them should also be part of the groups working on the organisation and this wish was respected.

Exam: The report, together with an oral presentation of the report for the organisation. Graded pass/fail.

Adjustments over time

In 2024, the course was transformed from a 10 ECTS course to a 15 ECTS course. It was decided that the students should work on their project proposals during the course. However, we have struggled to get all the students to complete their project proposal before the summer vacation.

After the spring term in 2025, the GLODE staff therefore decided to include the project proposal as an obligatory task for this course. A new lecture and seminar was added on

this topic. A draft project proposal was to be sent to the supervisor in the sixth week of the course. The students received feedback and sent the final proposal six days prior to the deadline for the report.

In the student evaluation, the students had the following to say about the project proposal being part of the course:

- Project proposal should be part of methods courses instead
- Deadline for the project proposal should be before draft of the project report
- Deadline should be after the presentation (1,5 – 2 weeks)
- Some were fine with the way it was done

Student evaluations

The course has been evaluated using an electronic questionnaire each year on the final day of teaching.

2024: 50% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of the course and 75% would recommend the course to others.

2025: 83% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the course, and 61% said that the course met their expectation.

2026: 65% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the course and 50% said that the course met their expectation.

Based on the free text comments, one reason for the lower level of satisfaction in 2026 was that half of the students did not get to do data collection, since the organisations wanted two of the four groups to do a desk study. Generally, the students like to practice what they have learned in their methods courses by doing interviews (qual) or making a small survey (quant). However, for this course to be organized year after year, GLODE needs to collaborate well with the organisations. This means that we need to do tasks that are useful for the organisations.

Another challenge we have met over the years is poor communication from some of the organisations/individual representatives of the organisations, which have seriously delayed the students' work on their reports.

For all the three years, the experiences with group work are mixed. One example from the student evaluation in 2026: "Some members wanted to do enough to pass the course and others wanted to deliver the best possible results". One student reports that he/she feels that he/she didn't contribute much.

In 2026, the students were asked the following question: "*As a student, I put down the efforts required to get maximum learning outcomes".* Approximately half of the students answered yes, others admitted that they "could have done more", or state they since

they have part-time job and work as a volunteer, they could not achieve the “maximum learning outcomes”.

The students have very different opinions about the organised sessions for the group work. Some said they were important, others said they were unproductive.

Student suggestions for improvements of the course (2026 evaluation)

- Send the report to the organization after the presentation, to include feedback
- Some want smaller groups (4 people)
- Less lectures
- Work more closely with the organization/meet more often with them

Conclusion

The course works well and the students produce good reports that the organisations are very content with and find useful. Our assessment is that there is good coherence between the learning outcome descriptions and the teaching and learning activities.

Less students were satisfied or very satisfied with the course in 2026 (65%) compared to 2025 (83%). This may be due to the tasks they were given by the organisations. It is a dilemma to balance the students’ priorities with the needs of the organisations that give the commissioned tasks. We depend upon good collaboration with organisations and institutions in Bergen for us to organise this course year after year.

Since the students’ suggestions for changes are so varied, the GLODE staff agree that no major changes should be made to the course. However, it could be a good idea to give the students feedback on the final draft and give them the opportunity to make changes before the report is shared with the organisation.

Some students find that completing the project proposal and writing the report at the same time is stressful, others handle it very well. Compared to 2024, we have reduced the hours of lectures to give the students time to work on the reports during obligatory seminars. Some students emphasise that the obligatory group work (seminars) are very useful, others felt that they were a waste of time.

When planning the schedule for course for 2027, we will consider whether the deadline for the project proposal should be earlier. It cannot be after the commissioned report (as suggested by some in the student evaluation), since the project proposal is an obligatory requirement and therefore needs to be completed before the exam (the report and oral presentation).

Appendix – the tasks

2024

Group 1. Skeiv Verden. Review Bergen municipality's policy and work regarding integration of LGBTQI+ refugees. Make an assessment of policies and work of one or more other Norwegian cities and/or European cities (Berlin and Amsterdam) that have specific asylum centres for queer refugees, and make recommendations for how efforts for the integration of LGBTQI+ refugees in Bergen may be improved.

Group 2. Hordaland Red Cross. Group 2 is asked to conduct a study that identifies barriers and facilitators for participation in the outdoor recreation activities Til Topps and RØFF, with attention to inclusion and diversity. The study should pay attention to the two activities separately and include the following:

- Different perspectives from participants and facilitators (staff and volunteers).
- Attention to the factors of gender and personal/family economy.
- Recommendations for measures that can be taken to strengthen inclusion within the guidelines for the activities.

Group 3. Hordaland Red Cross. Group 3 is asked to evaluate the access to and quality of information about outdoor recreation for migrants in the Nordic countries, by conducting a review of existing activities and the information available about these. The review can alternatively be combined with interviews with migrants who have experience with outdoor recreation as part of their integration. The study should include the following:

- Accessibility with attention to inclusion (language, disability etc).
- Recommendations on information to include in Finn Fram, including what it is important for migrants to learn about when it comes to outdoor recreation, and how it can benefit their integration.

2025

Group 1. Hordaland Red Cross. Diversity and inclusion in BARK (Children's Red Cross).

To achieve better inclusion of both volunteers and participants with functional diversity, we initially want to investigate which BARK groups who are already working on this topic in the Hordaland district, and which BARK groups have thought about this in the design

of their activity plans, the design of their premises, etc. We then want to initiate cooperation with organizations that are already good at this (including user organizations as well) to map the way forward.

Group 2. Queer World Vest. Examine the experiences of queer people with minority backgrounds in Skeiv Verden Vest's social meeting places.

Group 3. Hordaland Red Cross. With a particular focus on people with refugee and migration backgrounds in addition to people with disabilities we want to map out the following;

- The accessibility of the Red Cross's activities from a volunteer perspective and a participant perspective.
- What barriers to participation potentially exist in the organization.
- Which groups/people in society are or are at risk of becoming poorly included in the Red Cross.

2026

- Group 1. Skeiv Verden. How do LGBTQ+ Individuals with Minority Backgrounds in Vestland County experience the intersectional dimensions of discrimination?
- Group 2. Sustainable lives Landås. Can *Bærekraftige liv* (*Sustainable lives*) play a key role in strengthening national emergency preparedness?
- Group 3. Hordaland Red Cross. How can Hordaland Red Cross do impact assessments of its activities?
- Group 4. Hordaland Red Cross. How do volunteers in Hordaland Red Cross Youth handle undesired incidents?