



Community Health Research Methods

IPBH 3510 (4 credits/ 60 class hours)

International Honors Program

Health and Community: Globalization, Culture, and Care

PLEASE NOTE: This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

Course Description:

In order to understand health, illness, and treatment seeking in diverse communities, and to implement interventions that are contextually relevant, an empirically founded understanding of local contexts and the social, cultural, political, and economic factors at play is imperative. This course introduces a range of research methods that are used to collect qualitative and mixed methods data in order to answer specific research questions about experiences of health and illness. In this course, students will be introduced to key concepts and theories underlying health research methods as well as a suite of qualitative field research methods used to identify and address important public health issues. Students will gain practical experience planning, carrying out, coding, analyzing, and writing up research.

The central fieldwork component of this course is the Case Study project, a small group exercise focused on investigating a topic across country contexts using a variety of research methods. During the class sessions, students will develop research tools in order to better frame Case Study experiences and smaller data collection projects. Students will explore the various methods, as well challenges and ethical concerns in different contexts. The insights gained will prepare students for future work or study planning research and proposing appropriate interventions in public health or other fields.

Learning Outcomes:

The Community Health Research Methods course comprises 60 class hours of instruction (4 credits). In this course students will gain an understanding of community-based health and medical anthropological research, and apply methodological and ethical approaches to investigating Case Study topics in cross-cultural contexts. By the end of the course, students will be able to:

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

- Assess and choose appropriate research methodologies to explore research questions.
- Understand key ethical issues and challenges to conducting health research.
- Understand multiple research models and philosophies.
- Implement various data gathering techniques, including observation, interviews, focus groups, formal qualitative methods, etc.
- Analyze qualitative data effectively.
- Write-up researched findings comprehensively and cogently.
- Assess and implement various dissemination methods.

Course Schedule, Themes, and Readings:

In this class we will be drawing largely from the following texts (noted only by chapter below):

- Padgett, D. K. (2011). *Qualitative and mixed methods in public health*. Sage publications.
- Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Week	Topic	Readings	Country
RM-1	Introduction to Health Research Methods Skills: Observation (w field notes) Basic Ethics	<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 1: Introduction. Pages1-23 • Padgett, D. K. Chp 6, Entering the field and Observing. P 101-119 <p>Suggested Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kendall, Carl. "Public health and the domestic domain: lessons from anthropological research on diarrheal diseases." <i>Anthropology and primary health care</i> (1990): 173-195. • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 2: Choosing the Right Qualitative Approach. Pages29-41 	USA

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

<p>RM-2</p> <p>Interviewing And Rapid Appraisal</p> <p>Skills: Interviewing 1 Field Notes</p>		<p><u>Required Readings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 7: Interviewing p 123-52 • De Leon, Jason and Jeffrey Cohen. 2005. Object and Walking Probes in Ethnographic Interviewing. <i>Field Methods</i> 17(2): 200-204. • Annett, H., and S. B. Rifkin. "Guidelines to rapid participatory appraisal to assess community health needs. Division of Strengthening of Health Services." <i>World Health Organisation, Geneva</i> (1995). P 1-23 <p><u>Suggested Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. . Chapter 3: Mixed Methods. Pages 47-64 • Bernard. <i>Field Notes</i> Chp 14 p387-98 	<p>Vietnam</p>
<p>RM-3</p> <p>Ethics</p> <p>Community Engaged Research</p> <p>Skills: Ethics</p>		<p><u>Required Readings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 5 (Ethics) p 81-99 • Diallo, Dázon Dixon, and Paula M. Frew. "Community Engagement in Public Health Research." <i>Public Health Research Methods</i> (2014): 101. (15 pages) • Hacker, Karen, and Greg Guest. "IN FOCUS." <i>Public Health Research Methods</i> (2014): 123. IN: Guest, Greg, and Emily E. Namey, eds. <i>Public health research methods</i>. Sage Publications, 2014. (5 pages- In same PDF as Diallo reading) <p><u>Suggested Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 4 (getting started) 65-80 	
<p>RM-4</p> <p>Methods Mash-up</p> <p>Skills: Observation Interviews Ethics</p>		<p><u>Required Readings:</u></p> <p><i>Note: students will be broken into groups and have only one set of the following readings.</i></p> <p>Observation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bernard, H. Russell. (2006). Participant observation. pp. 342-386. • Chataway, C.J. (2001). Negotiating the observer-observed relationship: Participatory action research. In D.L. Tolman & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), <i>From subjects to subjectivities: A handbook of interpretive and participatory methods</i> (pp. 239-255). New York, NY: NYU Press. <p>Interviewing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. Chapter 9: Interviewing: Unstructured and Semistructured, pp. 210- 250. • Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy. 2007. <i>The Practice of Feminist</i> 	

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

		<p>In-Depth Interviewing. <i>In</i> Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Lina Leavy (eds.) <i>Feminist Research Practice</i>. Thousand Oaks: Sage</p> <p>Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cahill, Caitlin, Farhana Sultana, and Rachel Pain. "Participatory ethics: politics, practices, institutions." <i>ACME: an international e-journal for critical geographies</i> 6.3 (2007): 304-318. • Marina Marouda & Margaret Sleeboom-Faulkner. "Have we become too ethical?" <i>Medicine Anthropology Theory</i>. • Flicker, Sarah, and Adrian Guta. "Ethical approaches to adolescent participation in sexual health research." <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i> 42.1 (2008): 3-10. 	
RM-5	Walking as a research tool for understanding health, place and wellbeing	<p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ross, Fiona. (2010). Chapter 3. Sense-scapes: sense and emotion in the making of place. In <i>Raw Life, New Hope. Decency, Housing and Everyday Life in a Post-Apartheid Community</i>. Cape Town: UCT Press, pp. 54-75. • Pink, Sarah. (2015). Walking with others. In <i>Doing Sensory Ethnography, 2nd ed.</i> Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 111-115. <p><u>Suggested reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carpiano, Richard. M. (2009). Come take a walk with me: The "Go-Along" interview as a novel method for studying the implications of place and health and wellbeing. <i>Health and Place</i> 15(1): 263-272. • Cohen, J. (2009). "Medicine from the Father: <i>bossiesmedisyne</i>, people, and landscape in Kannaland". <i>Anthropology Southern Africa</i>. 32(1 and 2): 18-26. • Lee, Jo and Ingold, Tim. (2006). "Fieldwork on foot: perceiving, routing, socializing." In Coleman and Collins (Eds.) <i>Locating the Field: Space, Place and Context in Anthropology</i>. Oxford: Berg pp. 67-86. 	South Africa
RM-6	Focus groups Skills: Focus Groups	<p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ouspenski, A. "We fight more than we sleep': Shelter access by transgender individuals in Cape Town, South Africa." (2013). http://genderdynamix.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/GDX-Shelter-Report.pdf • Morgan, D. "Focus groups as qualitative research." <i>Planning</i> 10.9781412984287 (2013): n4. Selection TBD <p><u>Suggested reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chappell, Paul. "Secret languages of sex: disabled youth's 	

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

		experiences of sexual and HIV communication with their parents/caregivers in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa." <i>Sex Education</i> 16.4 (2016): 405-417.	
RM-7	Formal Qualitative Methods Skills: Free lists, Pile Sorts, Folk Taxonomy, Domain Analysis, surveys	<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. Chapter 10: Structured Interviewing 1 (Excerpts p 251-64, 269-77, 286-87, 298) • Bernard, H. Russell, and Ryan, G. W. 2010. Cultural Domain Analysis: Free Lists, Judged Similarities and Taxonomies. <i>In Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches</i>. London: Sage, pp. 163-189. <p>Suggested Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft- SOGI Measurement Excerpt- Forthcoming 	
RM-8	Data Analysis	<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 8 (Analysis) • Lewins, Ann, and Christina Silver. "Choosing a CAQDAS package." (2009). P1-5 (the rest of the article is optional) <p>Suggested Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chap 9 (Rigor)- • Silver, Christina, and Ann Lewins. <i>Using software in qualitative research: A step-by-step guide</i>. Sage, 2014. Chp 3. Software Summaries 	Argentina
RM-9	Data presentation and dissemination	<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padgett, D. K. Chapter 10 (Telling the story)p 221-38 • Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. <i>International Journal for Quality in Health Care</i>, 19(6), 349-357. • Cahill, C. & Torre, M.E. (2007). Beyond the journal article: Representations, audience, and the presentation of participatory research. In S. Kindon, R. Pain and M. Kesby (Eds.), <i>Participatory Action Research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place</i>. Abingdon, England: Routledge. <p>Suggested Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R.D. Branson. "Anatomy of a Research Paper." <i>Respiratory Care</i>. 2004; 49 (10): 1222-1228. 	

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandelowski, Margarete. 1998. Writing A Good Read: Strategies for Re-Presenting Qualitative Data. <i>Research in Nursing & Health</i> 21: 375-382. • Farmer, Paul. 2009. Fighting Words. <i>In Anthropology Off the Shelf: Anthropologists on Writing</i>. Waterson, Alisse and Maria Vesperi, Eds. Pp 182-190. 	
RM-10	Research as activism	<p>Required Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DANNY. BURNS. Navigating Complexity in International Development: Facilitating Sustainable Change at Scale. Practical action pub, 2015. Chp 4- Seeing the system- participatory systemic inquiry. p 59-99 AND Chapter 5. Systemic Action Research p101-112 <p>Suggested Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fals-Borda, O. (1979). Investigating the reality in order to transform it: The Colombian experience. <i>Dialectical Anthropology</i>, 4(1), 33-55. • Freire, P. (1982). Creating alternative research methods: Learning to do it by doing it. In B. Hall, A. Gillette, and R. Tandon, (Eds.), <i>Creating knowledge: A monopoly</i> (pp. 29-37). New Delhi, India: Society for Participatory Research in Asia. 	

Evaluation & Grading Criteria

The following is an overview of assignment responsibilities. Further details (particularly on case study assignments) will be discussed and given as we move through the semester. I will also be as available as I can be to discuss these projects when and if you have questions about them, as will country co-ordinators (in regard to case study assignments). Assignments should be typed in electronic format, in Gill Sans MT size 11 font, 1.5 spaced lines, and with 'normal' sized margins. The **American Psychological Association** (APA) referencing style is preferred.

Please hand in all assignments on **USB, not via email**. Please include your name on **every page of the assignment itself**, as well as in the **file name**. Save the files in Microsoft word. Where visual/handwritten assignments are set, please take clear photographs of these and submit as digital files. Fieldnote journals, however, should be submitted in their handwritten (i.e. non-digitized) form. It should also be noted that due to occasional in-country logistics and circumstances beyond our control, faculty reserve the right to adapt the syllabus details and organization.

Case Study work will always be due the morning of your case study day

Country	Description	Points
Short Fieldwork Methods Exercises		24
USA	Neighborhood Day: This is a discussion based, non-graded activity	0
Viet Nam	Interview Exercise	8

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

South Africa	Walking Ethnography Exercise	8
Argentina	Coding and Reporting Exercise	8
Case Studies (Group Grade)		55
U.S.A.	10 min (+5 Q&A)	5
Vietnam	20 minutes (+5 Q&A)	15
South Africa	20 minutes (+5 Q&A)	15
Argentina	40 minutes (+10 Q&A)	20
Case Studies (Individual Grades)		11
U.S.A.	Field Notes and Reflections	2
Vietnam	Field Notes and Reflections	3
South Africa	Field Notes and Reflections	3
Argentina	Field Notes and Reflections	3
Participation & Engagement		10

Short Fieldwork Methods Exercises

A short fieldwork methods project will be set in each country. These are **in addition** to case study assignments (see below). The aim of these activities is to offer students the opportunity to practice common techniques of social science research, carried out and written up individually (i.e. not in groups as in case study research).

1. Washington D.C.

Due: Case study presentation day – before presentations begin.

Further details of this will be given at launch, but this will be an **ungraded** observational assignment aimed at giving students a taste of making ethnographic observations and field notes centring on the urban environment of Washington D.C. This will help familiarize you with your fieldwork journals – a central tool in the skills you will learn throughout the course, as well as contributing toward your overall grade for the research methods course (though, again, this first exercise is not graded).

2. Vietnam: Interview, transcription and reflection exercise

Due: Case study presentation day – before presentations begin.

For this exercise you will work in pairs but produce individual (and individually graded) transcriptions and short essays. Get into pairs with another student and take turns interviewing each other on a topic related to health, illness and wellbeing. This should be an in-person, semi-structured interview. The interviewer should come up with a brief field guide with 1-2 domains and a few prompts for each. The interview should be around 10 minutes long and recorded on a digital device (such as a phone, computer program, or specific audio recorder). If you do not have access to one of these, let the instructor know. Following the interview, the interviewer should transcribe at least 4 pages worth of content. Note that the interviewee should also remain anonymous in that his or her name does not appear in the text of your work.

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

The student will then write a brief, two-part reflection piece (700-800 words in total) on the experience, addressing the following questions:

As interviewer:

1. Overall, how did the interview go? Why?
2. How comfortable was it working with your field guide? What changes would you make in the future?
3. How might aspects of your identity help or hinder the interview?
4. What would you do differently if you were able to do it again?
5. How was the process of transcribing?

As interviewee:

1. Overall, how did the interview go? Why?
2. Did any of the questions make you feel uncomfortable? Why?
3. Did the presence of the recording device affect you at all? Why? How?
4. What could your interviewer have done differently to improve the process?

Include the field guide and the transcript (in addition to the 800 word limit).

Grading Schedule

Requirement	Points
Basic completion of all aspects of exercise, keeping to word count limit.	3
Quality of the field guide	1
Reflection part of exercise is clearly written, well communicated, and responds to topic	4
Total	8

3. South Africa: **Walking ethnography exercise.**

Due: Case study presentation day, South Africa – before presentations begin.

For safety reasons, this exercise should be done in pairs, although the assignment itself is individually written and graded.

Ask someone from a host community, perhaps a homestay family member, if they are willing to take you on a short walk (maximum 30 minutes in length) around key spots in their local neighbourhood as part of your class exercise. Think about a small research question you would like to approach having to do with health. It may help if you formulate the question *with* your proposed participant. One research idea is for them to show you sites they perceive as positively/negatively associated with wellbeing (if any). Ask your participant to show you places that are particularly significant for them, and which are relevant to the research question you are approaching. See Carpiano (2009) for tips on how to identify what these might be.

Take your field journal and pen with you and ask your participant to tell you about these places and sites as you move near or through them. Note these down, the route you are taking, and anything else you think might be of significance later on – either about the locality itself, or anyone’s actions and emotions. What kind of social relations, sights, sounds, smells, or other sensations are linked to those places? Does your research participant associate these sensorial aspects with the significance they derive from that place? If appropriate, you can take photographs of significant places encountered on your walk.

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

Upon returning from your walk, discuss your notes, your photographs (if any) and your shared experience with your participant. If it helps make sense of things, and if your research participant feels comfortable doing it, you could ask them to draw a map of the route they took you on and then place your route, and significant sites on this map. See also if there is anything they wish to add to the sense you have made of their experience. While the research experience was co-conducted, write up your experience and reflections individually in the form of a descriptive mini ethnography (1000 word maximum). Please describe the process of doing the interview, the route you took, the social-sensorial contexts of the walk, initial conclusions, and your personal reflections on the process. Please also address the following questions:

1. Overall, how did the exercise go? What did you enjoy or dislike?
2. What did you learn in response to your research query? Were you able to answer your research question? Why? Why not?
3. Pink (2015), Carpiano (2009), and Lee and Ingold (2006) all argue that walking with research participants can help to develop a sense of empathy and level hierarchies between researcher and researched. Did you find this to be true? Why? Why not?
4. How did the experience of working with a research partner (the other student) help or hinder (or a bit of both) the research experience?
5. What would you do differently if you were able to conduct this activity a second time? What did you learn from a methodological perspective?

Please include your field guide with the assignment.

Grading Schedule

Requirement	Points
Basic completion of all aspects of exercise, keeping to word count limit.	3
Quality of the field guide	1
Reflection part of exercise is clearly written, well communicated, and responds to topic	4
Total	8

4. Argentina: Coding and Reporting Exercise

Due: Case study presentation day, Argentina – before presentations begin.

Part 1: Recall the interview exercise from Vietnam. You will now develop a basic a priori (before you begin coding) code tree for the transcript and apply the codes. You are able to edit the code tree as you apply the codes but make note of the changes. After completing the coding write a brief response (300 words) to the following prompts.

1. Overall, how did you find the coding experience? Describe any changes you made to your original code tree.
2. In the future would you prefer an a priori code tree, and inductive coding process, or a mix? Why?
3. How did coding impact the way you understand your data, if at all?

Part 2: Recall the walking ethnography exercise from South Africa. Use Tong’s “Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups” to reflect upon the process. In a short paper (600 words) briefly respond to all 32 points on the COREQ checklist, as much as possible. Then respond to the below prompts:

1. Which items on the checklist were easiest and hardest to respond to? Why?

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

2. At this point in the semester, you have read many ethnographies, research articles, and reports. Consider which points on the checklist are more commonly covered and which are more commonly left out in the various types of research products. In which ways is that problematic? Write about your observations.

Grading Schedule

Requirement	Points
Coding Exercise complete and well done	2
Response to coding reflection is clearly written, well communicated, and responds to topic	2
COREQ response is complete and well done	2
COREQ Reflection is clearly written, well communicated, and responds to topic	2
Total	8

Case Studies: Case study projects provide an opportunity to apply the methods learned in the Research Methods course while learning about a particular health issue. You will be assigned to a case study group of 5-6 students, focusing on one health issue over the course of the semester. Case studies are country-specific, and coordinated by the Country Coordinators; therefore, they may be organized differently in the U.S., Vietnam, South Africa, and Argentina. Given time constraints and potential language barriers (particularly in Vietnam and Argentina), Faculty and Country Coordinators will pre-determine possible research topics and arrange a preliminary list of contacts to facilitate the research process.

In your case study you will have the opportunity to synthesize information learned throughout the program – in your classes, guest lectures, site visits, homestays – with targeted research visits. Your objective will be to learn how to conduct a qualitative research project (rather than an opportunity to produce detailed data about a particular health issue). How do you know what to ask? How do you ask it? Whom do you ask? In case studies you will learn by doing – conducting exploratory research, crafting a research question, collecting good data, and learning how to cogently analyze and synthesize your data in order to dig deeper with new meaningful questions. Country Coordinators and Local and Travelling Faculty will consult with the groups on an ongoing basis regarding ways in which to integrate course concepts and tools into your research projects.

Except in rare cases, the same group grade will be given to all members of your case study group for your **case study presentation** (and the work leading up to it), **so teamwork is essential! See note below on group grades.**

Case Study Presentations Requirements:

While groups have substantial creative freedom to craft their presentations to best fit their projects, all group presentations should address the following topics:

- What were your specific research question and sub-questions?
- What theory or theories did you draw on to approach this research?
- What methods did you use?
- What worked and what did not (in regards to particular methods, theoretical approaches, etc.)? What facilitated the aspects of your project that worked and hindered the aspects of the project that didn't work?
- What were your preliminary conclusions? What were the most interesting/exciting findings?
- What ethical issues did you negotiate during the course of the research?
- What were the limitations of this research?
- What are the future directions of this project? With more time, how would you develop this project? What methods might you engage? How might you do things differently if given a second chance?
- Note: Making mistakes and having things go awry is to be expected. How you engage with and learn from those moments is critical to this process.

Field Journal Requirements:

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

To be a great (or even a good) qualitative researcher, you must take thorough fieldnotes. During all of your case study research time you will be expected to keep a field journal, making jottings while in the field and then fleshing them later that day. This should also include your reflections on what you are learning and the process, including any ah-ha moments. Your notebooks will be handed in on your case study presentation days and will count toward your case study grade.

United States:

- Case Study Group Presentation I (10 minutes, +5 minutes for Q&A). This presentation is based in part on the Case Study visits. Students will participate in activities designed to introduce observational techniques and develop field note skills. Groups will present their findings as a result of their research experience in a Washington DC neighborhood and following the fieldnotes exercise of the case study.

Viet Nam:

- Case Study Group Presentation II (20 minutes, + 5-10 minutes for Q&A). This presentation will cover the methodological and ethical insights gained, as well as preliminary findings, through doing cross-cultural participatory research on a particular topic.

South Africa:

- Case Study Group Presentation III (20 minutes, + 5-10 minutes for Q&A). See above.

Argentina

- Case Study Group Presentation IV (40 minutes, +10-15 minutes for Q&A). This presentation is longer because it is the final one in the program; the presentation will cover 20 minutes of Argentina content using the same format at Viet Nam and South Africa as well 20 minutes of comparative content, included methods, ethics, theory, and content.

Note on Group Grades:

Grades for case studies will largely be given as group grades. However, faculty and staff will be actively checking in on group dynamics and participation to ensure that all members are participating and contributing equally to a great research experience. In select cases when appropriate, an individual grade may be given in the place of a group grade.

Participation and Engagement:

In each country program you will receive a participation and engagement grade. All staff are active in collectively discussing this part of students' grade based on participation and engagement throughout the program, particularly in class, with guest lecturers, and on site visits. Data are all around us, and in this course you will learn how to identify them, capture them, analyze them, and make sense of them. To do that, you must be present and engaged.

Expected Conduct:

This program gives you the unique opportunity to enter through doors that would be otherwise closed to you, to speak to people whose voices you might otherwise not hear. And, as we will discuss throughout this semester, a huge part of being a great researcher is knowing how to ethically engage with your fieldsite(s), the people who inhabit those spaces, and the people who make it all possible. As student researchers finding your way in new spaces, you will navigate how to show daily acts of reciprocity through respectful engagement with the people on the ground.

Here are some basic guidelines on what is expected from your conduct in the field:

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

- Take notes in class and during guest lectures (or demonstrate in-class engagement in the way that works for your learning style)
- Take fieldnotes during sites visits and case studies (this shows respect and is how we become better researchers)
- Stay engaged during program (listening, responding, asking questions)
- Demonstrate respect to those around you (your interlocutors, your hosts, your homestay, your staff, your peers)
- Stay off technology during program time (be present and engaged)

Grading Scale

**Note, grades will be rounded up at .5 and above i.e. a 93.5 would round to 94 and result in an A. 93.4 would result in an A-.*

94-100%	A	Excellent
90-93%	A-	
87-89%	B+	
84-86%	B	Above Average
80-83%	B-	
77-79%	C+	
74-76%	C	Average
70-73%	C-	
67-69%	D+	
64-66%	D	Below Average
Below 64	F	Fail

Expectations and Policies

Class preparation:

This program is built upon the strong belief that your experiences result in deep insights and powerful learning. Course assignments are created to facilitate learning opportunities and experiences. Dialogue in class about these insights and participation in these activities is critical. For this reason, your participation is very important. As a learning community, each one of us will influence the learning environment. Please take responsibility for your role in this environment and come to class prepared and ready to engage with others in a positive and thought-provoking manner.

Attendance & Participation:

IHP is an experiential learning program. You have to show up to have the experience. As such, attendance and participation is a minimum expectation, not generally to be rewarded with class credit. Students are expected to attend all classes, guest lectures, and field activities unless they have a medical excuse that has been communicated and approved of by IHP staff, faculty, or fellow. The Fellow will act as a TA for the class and will keep attendance. *Missing one class means a small makeup assignment (as determined by the faculty), missing two classes means a sizable makeup assignment; missing three classes means a grade reduction of 2% of the total course grade.* Keep in mind that IHP is an experiential program, and has academic requirements to attend class meetings and field activities. Failure to attend classes or field activities means that a student may not be eligible for credit from their universities, or could result in program dismissal.

Policy on deadlines:

Coursework assignments are due on the deadlines indicated in the assignment handouts. Work is due at the start of the day on which it is due, either during the Person of the Day (POD) announcements, or at the beginning of

** This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.*

class. Unexcused late work will result in the lowering of the student's grade one full step per day (for example, a B will drop to a B-). No exceptions will be permitted; extensions are not given unless there are *exceptional* circumstances. Exact deadlines for assignments will be confirmed in class. *Keep an additional copy of all work you turn in*, so as to avoid unexpected disaster and significant inconvenience for all parties involved; this may mean photocopying or scanning any handwritten assignments. Assignments that are not easily legible will be returned ungraded.

Technology in the classroom:

Electronic devices are critical tools for learning and communication, but our IHP courses prioritize engaged conversations unhindered by personal electronic devices. *Students, faculty, and visitors are expected to keep cell phones, laptop computers, and other devices out of sight, sound, and mind during class sessions*—except under extenuating circumstances that have been discussed in advance with the faculty member.

Academic integrity:

Academic dishonesty is the failure to maintain academic integrity. It includes, but is not limited to, obtaining or giving unauthorized aid on an examination, having unauthorized prior knowledge of the content of an examination, doing work for another student, having work done by another person for the student, and plagiarism. Academic dishonesty can result in severe academic penalty, including failure of the course and/or dismissal from the institution/program.

Plagiarism is the presentation of another person's ideas or product as one's own. Examples of plagiarism are: copying verbatim and without attribution all or parts of another's written work; using phrases, charts, figures, illustrations, computer programs, websites without citing the source; paraphrasing ideas, conclusions or research without citing the source; and using all or part of a literary plot, poem, film, musical score, computer program, websites or other artistic product without attributing the work to its creator. Students can avoid unintentional plagiarism by carefully following accepted scholarly practices. Notes taken for papers and research projects should accurately record sources of material to cited, quoted, paraphrased or summarized, and research or critical papers should acknowledge these sources in references or by use of footnotes.

Violations of IHP/SIT Study Abroad's academic integrity policy are handled as violations of the student code of conduct, and will result in disciplinary action. Please discuss this with me if you have any questions.

Please refer to the SIT Study Abroad Student Handbook for policies on academic integrity, ethics, warning and probation, diversity and disability, sexual harassment, and the academic appeals process.

* This syllabus is representative of a typical term. Because courses develop and change over time to take advantage of unique learning opportunities, actual course content varies from semester to semester. In addition, considerations of student safety may change some course content.

IHP - Health and Community: Community Health Research Methods
Case Study Group Presentation

Group: _____

1. **Group preparedness:**

2. **Organization and methodology:**

3. **Content:**

4. **Clarity of presentation:**

5. **General comments with reference to local knowledge and realities — Country**
Coordinator feedback: *(Student interpretations are culturally accurate and appropriate; potential impact and/or importance on student conclusions from apparently extraneous local social circumstances—political, economic, religious, etc.)*

IHP - Health and Community: Globalization, Culture, and Care
 Community Health Research Methods
Case Study Group Presentation

Group: _____

	F	D	C	B	A
Group preparedness	Presentation poorly planned, lack of sufficient preparation time very evident.	Presentation deficient in preparedness, members show uncertainty with some key points.	Presentation shows limited preparation time, but members comfortable with material.	Presentation responsibilities well distributed, and all members well prepared albeit with limited uncertainty.	Presentation shows very cohesive and comprehensive preparation time, all members exhibit strong certainty in roles.
Organization and methodology	Presentation is disorganized and inhibits an understanding of group's ideas.	Presentation lacks organization, and does not connect observations to key findings.	Presentation is somewhat organized, but clear findings are difficult to discern.	Presentation is organized, but does not address a complete variety of ideas. Key findings are present; conclusions are clear.	Presentation fluidly addresses a number of different topics, while presenting a clear discussion of further paths of inquiry.
Content	Content focus is unclear, and with little or no relevancy to the study theme.	Content insufficiently analyzed, and lack of in-depth analysis is evident.	Content adequately analyzed and discussed, but conclusions and further directions are not well thought out.	Content is analyzed and discussed well, but falls short of considering further directions.	Content is very clearly presented, and reveals important insights and proposals for new theme directions.
Clarity and Creativity of presentation	Presentation is poorly designed, and does not effectively present ideas.	Presentation is not effective at communication of key ideas, but has some elements of creativity.	Presentation is somewhat effective at communication of key ideas, but is not organized or clear.	Presentation is effective at communication of key ideas, but lacks Some creativity.	Presentation is engaging and creative. Presentation effectively communicates major key points. Teamwork is evident.
Time usage	Presentation ran significantly over time or under time allotted, and either way was insufficient for adequately covering material.	Presentation time insufficient for adequate coverage of all relevant material.	Presentation needed to be markedly hurried in order to stay within a reasonable range of the time allotted, and concluded irregularly.	Presentation covered all relative material, but allotted time was exceeded to a minor but significant degree.	Presentation succeeds in covering all relevant issues within, or very closely approximating, allotted time period.

Final Grade:

IHP - Health and Community: Globalization, Culture, and Care
 Community Health Research Methods
Individual Case Study Reflection Papers and Field Journals – Grade & Feedback

Name:

Criterion	Standards
Responsiveness to topics	<p>A – Strongly addresses the topics, and responds very effectively to all aspects of the assignment.</p> <p>B – Clearly addresses the topics, but may respond to some aspects more comprehensively or effectively than others.</p> <p>C – Adequately addresses the topics, but may omit relevant and pertinent aspects.</p> <p>D – Indicates confusion about the topics and overall assignment, or significantly neglects important aspects.</p> <p>F – Suggests an inability to comprehend the assignment, or to respond meaningfully to the topics.</p>
Communication of ideas	<p>A – Explores relevant issues through strong analyses of data/experience; goes significantly beyond the simple or obvious.</p> <p>B – Shows good depth and complexity of thought.</p> <p>C – May treat the topics simplistically or repetitively; doesn't demonstrate sufficient analysis of data and/or experience.</p> <p>D – Lacks focus, demonstrates confused or simplistic thinking, or fails to adequately communicate ideas.</p> <p>F – Unfocused, illogical, incoherent or disorganized.</p>
Organization and clarity of expression	<p>A – Very coherently organized, with ideas/statements consistently supported by strong reasons or examples.</p> <p>B – Well organized and developed, with frequently appropriate reasons or examples.</p> <p>C – Adequately organized and developed; generally supports ideas/statements with appropriate reasons or examples.</p> <p>D – Poorly organized and/or undeveloped; lacks support from data and/or experience.</p> <p>F – Undeveloped; provides little or no relevant support or rationale.</p>
Control of mechanics (sentence structure, grammar, spelling, etc.)	<p>A – Overall, completely or reasonably free from errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure.</p> <p>B – May have occasional errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure.</p> <p>C – May have recurring errors, but generally demonstrates control of mechanics, usage, and sentence structure.</p> <p>D – Often marred by an accumulation of errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure.</p> <p>F – Serious and persistent errors in word choice, mechanics, usage, and sentence structure.</p>
Word count	<p>A – Word count minimum/maximum range reasonably met.</p> <p>F – Word count minimum/maximum range not reasonably met.</p>

Comments:

Final Grade: