

MPHP34	Kostnadseffektivitet och effektutvärdering av hälsointerventioner			7,5 ECTS
Year 22/23	Course start: 2022-08-29	Course end: 2022-09-28	Study rate 100%	
Course leader(s)	Johan Jarl, Martin Fischer			
Examiner	Johan Jarl			

The course

Number of students	At start: 12	At the end: 11		
Examination module (name, credits)	Passed at first attempt	Passed later		
1901, skriftlig tentamen, 7,5 hp	8			
1902, kursportfölj, 3,0 hp	11			
Number of other teachers involved: 5	Of which professors, 1 readers (docent), 2 holding PhD, 2 Phd students, other, and non LU or RS employed.			
	Of which 2 were core course conveners, 3 guest lecturer, assistants, or other minor contributors.			
It was easy to find competent teachers	If no, in what field of knowledge was it hard to find teachers? Why?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no				
Short description of the course:				
The course is an introduction to evaluation of healthcare interventions. The course have two closely connected parts: 1) impact evaluation, i.e. statistical methods to assess effectiveness of health interventions using observational data (quasi-experimental design), and 2) economic evaluations.				
Pedagogic model(s) used in the course (exemplify how you work):				
The learning activities include lectures ("traditional" and flipped classroom), training sessions and one seminar. In addition, the course contained individual assignments, quizzes in connection to the flipped classroom lectures, and an individual written exam.				
Major changes from last year:				
The following major issues were identified when the course was given in the autumn of 2021 and the implemented changes:				
* A discrepancy in the requirement for pass/pass with distinction between the two parts of the course - although we did not change the curriculum due to a missed deadline, we adjusted the examination to account for this by introducing different questions for pass and pass with distinction for the economic evaluation part.				
* A time consuming group assignment where students spent too much time on minor issues - group assignment changed into five individual assignment with short deadlines for submission.				

* Training sessions that rather repeated the lecture than serving as a link between lectures and examinations - training sessions revised to focus on (practical) problem solving.

In addition, due to that Gawain Heckley is doing a post-doc year in Melbourne, Australia, the course had a new teacher, Martin Fischer, responsible for the impact evaluation part of the course.

Summary of course quality evaluation

Results – focus on strengths and weaknesses

The course was largely given as planned with the exception that a summary of the reading by the teacher before the quizz in the flipped classroom was introduced in the second week of impact evaluation. This was after suggestion by the students.

11 students finished the course but one student was not allowed to write the final exam due to unpaid fees. 8 passed the exam, out of which two achieved pass with distinction. All students but one passed the course portfolio during the course period. The students were generally positive about the course and its content. During oral evaluation, several described the course as difficult but fun, much thanks to a very positive atmosphere among the students. 6 students answered the written course evaluation and all agreed that they felt they had reached the learning outcomes of the course, and questions on more specific course topics had very high ratings of perceived improved understanding. All students reported that they think they will use the taught tools in their future public health work and would recommend the course to future students. With regard to the results of the examination and the written course evaluation, we conclude that the course overall is of good quality both in terms of content and how it is delivered.

However, there are a number of possible improvements. Due to time constraints, the issue of societal inequalities was cut from the economic evaluation part of the course. This is a minor part in the teaching but something that generally interests students in public health and it will be included again the next time the course is given. The new individual assignments that replaced the group assignment from last year, worked overall well, especially in steering the students to focus on the most relevant aspects, manage their time, and as a channel for feedback. However, one major issue was the use of Stata. Students felt that they did not have sufficient experience in using Stata and that they had to focus too much on "getting it to work" in Stata rather than focus on learning the statistics. Overall, we consider this to be due to that the students did not have the anticipated knowledge of Stata when the course started. This is mainly an issue that needs to be considered in connection with the program in order to ensure sufficient progression of working with statistical software. Connected to this is also a lack of statistical knowledge on topics that have been covered previously during the programme. A programme wide discussion on the progression and in particular upkeep of statistical knowledge would be beneficial.

With regard to the impact evaluation part, some students expressed issues with the flipped-classroom approach and the quizzes. Direct verbal feedback was mixed with some students being positive while others were very negative. Constant exam pressure was mentioned for some as criticism. Although this was changed already during the course, it remains an issue. The changes made in the second week received positive feedback from the students and increased their perceived learning success. A number of students also expressed criticism about the text book for quasi-experimental methods.

With regard to the written examination, the students expressed difficulty using the ipad in connection with long questions with multiple sub-questions. The need to scroll back and forth between the answer and the question made it hard to keep track and have sufficient overview.

Possible explanations

The teacher in the evaluation part was using the flipped classroom approach for the first time. This could explain the improvements in the second week regardless of changes. But the final implemented changes were in line with feedback from previous years, suggesting that improvements should be made and are possible.

Suggestions of measures and further development

Adjustment of the individual assignments to give more time for the first hand-in and potentially increasing the time period for the individual assignments to three weeks instead of two.

With regard to the written examination, this is mainly a technical limitation that should be considered by Ortrac and those responsible for supplying the hardware during examination. However, in the meanwhile are a number of solutions possible; we will review questions in terms of length and, when possible, avoid sub-questions and instead include these as separate questions in Ortrac. We will also supply a printed version of the exam during the examination to make scrolling redundant.

With regard to the lack of sufficient knowledge and experience using Stata, we will continue to discuss this progression within the programme with the programme management and teachers. We will also supply instructions and tutorials to the students before the start of the course to give them the opportunity to prepare. Finally, we will also, as suggested by a student, supply a quick reference guide with special emphasis on the use of Stata during the course.

Regarding the flipped-classroom approach, we will consider if alternative pedagogical approaches could better serve in this specific context and/or if the changes implemented during the second week should be the norm.

Signatures

Date:	Place:
Course leader	Student representative
Signature	Signature
Elucidation Johan Jarl	Elucidation Marie-Catherine Schaller

Appendix: Course evaluation