

Evaluation summary

HIV/AIDS, Prevention, Care, Treatment and Advocacy

Spring 2011

No of participants:

Response rate:

1.What was the percentage of your attendance/participation in the lectures/activities in the course?

a. 90%-100%	100%
b. 80%-89%	0%
c. 70%-79%	0%
d. 60%-69%	0%
e. less than 60%	0%

2. On average, how many hours a week (outside lecture/classroom hours) did you spend in this course?

a. 0 to 4 hours	33,3%
b. 5 to 8 hours	0%
c. 9 to 12 hours	33,3%
d. 13 to 16 hours	33,3%
e. 17 hours or more	0%

What worked well in the course	Suggestions for improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Interactive group work, case studies and presentations worked well! Level of knowledge was high among lecturers. Particularly those lecturers who had experience in low and middle income countries could mix theories with practice and make lectures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Programming and Advocacy components of the course were very restricted. The component Stigma and discrimination was taught at an interesting, but basic level, this could have been more elaborate. I would recommend a more interesting/useful method to test if

very interesting.

participants have acquired a certain level of knowledge and skills in this course. Debate (a number of course participants try to 'sell' different points of view on a certain issue and subsequently discuss), essay, reflection/description of key learnings?

Although the conference was part of the course, it was not really used or integrated in the course. (On the side, as a suggestion for improvement of the conference: I would rearrange seating in arena style for panel discussions, so that panel members are in the middle, and everybody can see and follow what's going on.)

-
- Some lectures given at PANUM were a rush over. E.g. Presentations mainly graphs and figures, but HIV transmission, MOT, and pathophysiology were not taught into the least details; too elementary for masters students.