



## Course evaluation template

After the course has ended, the course leader must fill in this template. The program director and education management will use your reflections to make adaptations to the program and/or the next time the course is given. The reflections will also be posted on the program web for students to read.

<b>Course code</b>  4FH089	<b>Course title</b> Applied epidemiology 1 – distribution of health	<b>Credits</b> 5 hp
<b>Semester</b> 2	<b>Period</b> 20220127-20220218	

<b>Course leader</b> Ana Requena Mendez	<b>Examiner</b> Ana Requena Mendez
<b>Other participating teachers</b>  Pär Flodin Jill Witney Åhs Liliana Carvajal Holly Newby Teymur Noori (ECDC) Anna Borgstrom Felix Chilunga Marie Hasselberg Mahmoud Hilali Julien Beauté (ECDC) Daniel Berglind Suzanne-van der Werf Pontus Hedberg Davide Valentini	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Davide Valentini

<b>Number of registered students</b> 22	<b>Number who have not completed the course<sup>1</sup></b> 1	<b>Number passed after regular session<sup>2</sup></b> 20
<b>Methods for student influence other than course survey<sup>3</sup></b> Students were asked to provide feedback once per week. They were specifically asked about the statistical part and also about the working group activities (video forum, outbreak investigation exercise, Critical skill workshop about challenges of surveillance in LMIC).		

<sup>1</sup> At the time of completed grading and mandatory assignments/revisions.

<sup>2</sup> After first summative examination.

<sup>3</sup> State: how the students were given the opportunity to participate in the preparation and decisions at course level, how the students were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the course and how this forms the basis of the analysis and proposals below, response frequency (for example, concluding survey 70 % response frequency, post-it notes – improvement suggestions after the second course week 90 % response frequency, course council 85 % attendance).

## Conclusions from the previous course evaluation

- Insert reflections from previous course evaluation.



The course leader was reflecting that the dataset of the assignment (compiling a public health report) was not update data. Data were coming from the Stockholm Public Health surveys (the last one was performed in 2010. Therefore, this year we added the possibility of compiling the report in another topic, COVID-19, based on a repository coordinated by OWID (Our World in data). Students could select different topics of the two datasets.

In addition, the fact of having guest lecturers with different background, not only researchers, was also well evaluated.

The strength was that the course was very well structured and also very interactive. Also, STATA practices were very much appreciated. New activities such as the outbreak investigation were also well evaluated, and therefore we have continued these activities in this edition.

Students appreciated the mentoring of the course leader during the assignment.

A total number of 20/22 students evaluated the course, and the mean answer for each question was between 4.5 and 5, All students stated that their “ability to communicate around the subject, both orally and in writing has increased” from some to large extent during the course.

### **Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion**

This year we added the possibility of compiling the report in another topic, COVID-19, based on a repository coordinated by OWID (Our World in data). Students could select different topics of the two datasets.

We also introduce another lecture on surveillance of infectious diseases with a guest lecture from Sudan and another one about non-communicable diseases with a focus on LMID (also with a guest lecturer from Malawi).

Finally students requested to have a lecture on outbreak investigation previous to the seminar “Contagion” and to the outbreak investigation exercise.

The rating criteria for the assignment changes compared with previous year. This year, each student should evaluate another assignment. The report on the review accounted now 5% of the score.

The course leader was actively participating in all interactive /working-group seminars collaborating with the other teachers.

### **Summary of the students' response to the course valuation**

- *Graphs and selected quotes from course surveys and any other instruments can be added as appendices if required.*

Students' evaluation in 2022

Answer count 11/22 (Very low response rate compared with last year)

Overall results: Results have been decreased a little bit compared with last year. Average (4.1, range 3.5-4.5). In particular, the questions related to ethical issues (3.5) However, the comments provided were very positive.



## The course leader's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

Reflections on the course's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, limitations within, for example, the following areas:

- How have the students' previous knowledge, experiences and prerequisites been used as a basis during the course?

The previous knowledge on STATA acquired in Biostatistics 1 was basic to follow the practice in statistic and to work on the data-analysis of the assignment. This year, it was clear that students need to focus exclusively on descriptive epidemiology. However, some students reflected that the contents of STATA lectures were too basic and

- In what way the work methods used during the course contribute to the students' attaining the learning outcomes? (Reflect on the selected learning activities and the students' type of engagement and presence in class)

The fact that the examination is to compile a public health report – choosing a topic, conducting a study, writing a report and present it in class- is one way to take the student's knowledge and experience into consideration, as well as the learning outcomes of the course.

- How has the course worked with -constructive alignment - from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content?

The students learnt during the lectures, different applications of epidemiology in different fields; also, they had working group activities and practical seminars (outbreak investigation). These were the educational and learning activities. They also improved their knowledge on how to use statistical software (STATA) for doing their own analysis. Finally, in the examination they need to select the topic and applied all the knowledge, what was well aligned with the objectives of the course

- How do examinations and assessment criteria ensure that students achieve the learning outcomes of the course? (Reflect on the choice of examination form and formative assessments.)

I think that the assignment was giving the opportunity to the students to conduct their first own research on epidemiological descriptive study. In this regard, they selected the topic, and decided the disease or risk factor they wanted to conduct the epidemiological surveillance. With the final report, we could evaluate very well their understanding on the data analysis required for epidemiological surveillance but also how to interpret the data.

The main drawback of the previous dataset was that it is quite old (last survey from 2010). Thereafter it is difficult to contextualize the topic that students selected with current literature. This year, a new dataset was also available for the assignment. There is an open access repository with disaggregated COVID-19 data that could be explored to be used in this regard. Therefore, this year they could select an infectious disease topic (COVID-19) or a non-communicable disease topic

## Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

The course was pleasantly very well evaluated despite of the fact that it was moved to online again due to COVID-19. I think there are some key factors for that .

1. The students liked the approach of having different teachers from different disciplines, beyond the research perspective. (e.g. ECDC, or the Swedish Public



Health Agency, or CES, or United Nations, and also teachers from LMIC). In addition, the students were in general very engaged to ask and discuss with the teachers that I think that also enjoyed a lot.

2. Interactive seminars were really appreciated and created a very nice atmosphere for opening discussion on different topics. They liked a lot the practical exercise of the outbreak investigation.
3. The assignment was a very nice exercise for them, but I think that the course leader need to closely encourage, supervise and support the students. This was much appreciated by them. Also, the new dataset introduced, the open-access repository with COVID-19 data was definitely a good alternative. Many students picked this option and results were very nice.
4. The practice in statistics were very well evaluated although one student highlighted that it was too simple for her. She was expecting to have more advanced teaching , in particular for the graph and figures development. I will consider it for next year.
5. This year, I was trying to have more teachers from LMIC (despite all teachers were requested to provide inputs on low-middle income countries on their topic and for some topics, it would be preferable to have teachers from other settings. One teacher was from Colombia, another from Sudan and another from Malawi (although currently in the University of Amsterdam). I think keeping an hybrid approach will facilitate this aspect requested by some students in previous years.

### **Other comments**

The evaluation of the course was shared with the MSc director