Course report

Course code: INTH328B COURSE TITLE: Global tuberculosis - epidemiology and intervention	Semester: Spring 2019	Department: Centre for international health, Department of global public health and primary care
Course coordinators: Sven Gudmund Hinderaker and Tehmina Mustafa	Approved in: P	rogramme Committee for Global

INTRODUCTION

This is an online course estimated to take 4 weeks. It gives online lectires, videos, exercises and discussion fora.

- Follow-up from previous evaluations:
- Learning outcomes: On completion of the course the student should have the following learning outcomes defined in terms of knowledge, skills and general competence:

Knowledge	Skills	General competence
The student:	The student:	The student: • knows how to control a disease in a public health approach, and to communicate this information. • has competence to assess the epidemiological situation for TB globally and to apply the knowledge to improve the management of TB. The student understands the importance of national programs and other stakeholders and their roles in TB control.

STATISTICS:							
Number of students: 26 Number of			ber of students	f students completing the course:			
Grade distribution ->:	A: 4	B: 16	C: 5	D: 0	E: 0	F: 1	
Pass: 25			Fail: 1				

SUMMARY OF THE STUDENT EVALUATION (main points):

• Practical implementation

The course went well, and many students enjoyed the course and the freedom of online environment. Some errors in new quizzes were quickly solved, ensuring no loss for students.

• Students' evaluations and feedback

More than half of the students (16/25; 64%) scored for evaluation of the course on various issues from 1 (poor) to 5 (good), and results are given below, highlighting in yellow the fields of potential improvements. The content and speed seem to be acceptable, see Q6,Q7,Q8.

	Question	n	min	max	Score 1-5
1.1	The course lived up to my expectations	15	4	5	4,5
1.2	The learning objectives for the module were clear	15	4	5	4,6
1.3	The learning objectives for the module were relevant to me	15	4	5	4,8
1.4	The course content covered all the learning objectives	15	4	5	4,5
1.5	The final assessment was relevant to the objectives	15	3	5	4,5
2.1	Interaction between participants was sufficient	16	2	4	<mark>3,8</mark>
2.2	Interaction between participants was contributing to my learning	16	2	5	3,7
2.3	Interaction between participants and teachers was of good quality	16	1	5	3,9
2.4	Online learning is appropriate for this course	16	1	5	4,1
2.5	The online learning platform used in this course was user-friendly	16	1	5	4,4
2.6	I enjoyed using online learning in this course	16	1	5	4,4
2.7	I participated actively in the discussion forum/ platform	16	2	5	3,8
2.8	The teaching material and learning units were well organised	16	1	5	4,4
2.9	The teaching material and classes were well prepared	16	2	5	4,4
2.10	The course facilitators were supportive throughout the course	16	1	5	4,4
2.11	The support provided by the course facilitators was sufficient in time	16	1	5	4,2
5	Score the course from 1=extrememly boring to 5=very interesting	16	4	5	4,6
6	Score amount of work required from 1=too little to 5=too much	16	3	5	3,6
7	Score the course work as 1="too easy" to 5="too difficult".	16	2	5	3,3
8	Score the pace of the course from 1="too slow" to 5="too fast"	16	3	4	3,1

Students comments:

Q3. Which of the teaching methods did you appreciate most?

Many students liked reading material, powerpoints, videos and quizzes. Many liked analysing a real life register.

Q9. Please list some POSITIVE aspects of the course:

Many students said it was a good course. It was convenient to decide time for own work. Good to gain knowledge BOTH from professors and students. Students liked the Toman's book, clear and consice. Many students enjoyed the practical cohort analysis.

Q10. Please list some WEAK aspects of the course you think should be improved.

The Lab register was confusing and needs more explanations. There could be better interaction between students, and with professors. Some lectures had very poor sound. Several students stated that the access to discussions should be open, not demanding a statement initially.

Q11. Comment about EXAM.

Students said the exam was OK. Many students enjoyed home exam, they liked that it covered all units and was good revision of the course, and had acceptable length.

Other comments

Some students commented that perhaps it is better to force students to take the modules in right sequence.

Comments from teachers

The course went well, many participated in voluntary discussion forums, but not all. The quiz cohort analysis had some errors that students detected, and it was resolved so that no student suffered.

Both teachers were course leaders and comments are given in next section

COURSE COORDINATORS EVALUATION:

Teaching and assessment methods:

The methods were all available online. Course included reading, lectures, videos, quizzes and exercises, and discussion. The course used portfolio assessment and grades were given based on the performance of activities in the modules, discussions and home exam. Questions were weighted according to importance. The final grades were given after an overall assessment, where good participation in discussion could contribute to grade when exam and MittUiB disagreed.

Curriculum:

Information and documentation:

Grade distribution: A: 16%; B: 64%, C: 20%

<u>Localities/equipment:</u> All was online

Field trip (if relevant): not relevant

<u>Changes done during the course:</u> No major changes during the course.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR NEXT EVALUATION PERIOD - IMPROVEMENTS TO BE MADE:

This is a short list of some issues to improve in 2020:

Get a new better register for cohort analysis

Improve audio on some presentations

Open discussion

Remove some old assignments?

Use ERJ monograph 2018?

Hide more elements

Explain YIELD

Improve cohort analysis

Improve interaction