

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4NT000	Course title Diet and health – scientific evidence, recommendations and sustainability	Credits 10
Semester Autumn -22	Period First period (29 Aug-11 Oct)	
Course coordinator Magdalena Rosell, Petter Fagerberg		Examiner Magdalena Rosell
Teacher in charge of component Magdalena Rosell, Petter Fagerberg		Other participating teachers Usama Al-Ansari, Elinor Hallström, Ellinor Nilsson, Elin Röö, Fredrik Söderlund, Anna-Maria Lampousi, and others
Number of registered students during the three week check 34	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey 89 %
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course council with three student representatives in the middle of the course as well as a discussion with the whole class at the end of the course.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students The students were informed via an announcement at Canvas 8/11		

1. Description of any conducted changes since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students

This is the first time this course is given. Some parts are the same or similar to the course on the one-year programme and some parts were changed. There were more lectures on study types, systematic review and meta-analysis and also journal clubs. Some other lectures were also expanded (for example the one with Elin Röö). The take-home exam part 1 was expanded.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course

Overall, students were satisfied with the course. In the course evaluation, the overall opinion of the course was rated good (57%) or very good (17%) by all students. However, the latter rate is lower than for the previous course and there are things to improve in the current course. In general, the questions in the course evaluation were rated relatively high, with some variations. From all evaluations (the electronic and discussions), the course contains too many parts, and the course could increase the focus on some themes and go more in depth in some areas. The workload seemed reasonable (most students had put 35-44 hours per week for the course) in relation to the course's credits.

3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

Strengths of the course: The course in general worked well regarding the content and structure. Relevant and basics topics in nutrition science are covered that the students need for the coming courses. Most students appreciated the content, including the environmental

aspects. The teaching forms were very appreciated, such as a lot of discussions and the debate, and also the take-home exam as an examination form. The students also appreciated that the teachers were supportive available.

Weaknesses of the course: It is a challenge to find a good way to handle the fact that the students have different backgrounds and different pre-knowledge in nutrition. For some students, parts of the course are repetition and for some students it is new stuff. Also, there are too many different themes in the course, in the form it was given this time and students' w. The take-home exam was experienced to be too long.

4. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

Based on the comments, we have many ideas to consider for next year. Among other things, we will expand and go more in depth into the part regarding scientific evidence (nutritional epidemiology and how to evaluate studies, how different types of studies forms the basis for establishing diet-disease associations and discussion of conflicting studies). The part about public health nutrition from a global perspective could be incorporated later in the course and adjusted to be connected to sustainability aspects instead of being a separate part of the course. The take-home exam part 1 can be replaced by different shorter written assignments during the course instead and the take-home exam part 2 can be somewhat adjusted to be a more coherent report. Instructions and a more structured peer-feedback regarding the practical task will be developed. We have several other ideas that will be discussed again with the course representatives in the beginning of next year, before the course syllabus will be revised.