# 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Course code****4FH098** | **Course title**Introduction to planning and program development | **Credits**5 hp |
| **Semester****VT23** | **Period**2023-01-26 – 2023-02-17 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course leader**Anna Toropova | **Examiner** Lydia Kwak and Anna Toropova |
| **Other participating teachers**Lydia Kwak, Liselotte Schäfer Elinder, Josefin Edwall, Gisela Nyberg, Femke Van Nassau, Soha El Halabi, Rita Bakesiima, Tanja Tomson, Elisabeth Björk Brämberg, Emmanuel Aboagye | **Other participating teachers****Group work:** Ida Karlsson, Anna Toropova, Jefferey Casely-Hayford, Andreas Rödlund |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of registered students**19 | **The number who have not completed the course1** 2 | **Number passed after regular session2 17** |
| **Methods for student influence other than course survey3**The students were involved in discussions about the course during the course introduction. They were asked about their pre-knowledge of the subject and their preferences regarding course administration. The students were asked to give feedback on the pros and cons of the course on a weekly basis, in group and individually, and even after a given lecture/group assignment. Discussions were also held during the last day of the course. An informal evaluation was conducted by the student representative after last course day, but prior to examination. The oral feedback and evaluations gave valuable insights into the course content. Response frequency in concluding surveys, both formal and informal was around 50%. |

## 1 *At the time of completed grading and mandatory assignments/revisions.*2 After first summative examination.

3 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

## Conclusions from survey 2022 by Lisa Holmlund:

My overall conclusion is that the course worked well and that most students achieved the learning outcomes. The online format is not optimal for this course, especially not for lectures.

## Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

The main change from 2022 was that the course was 100% classroom-based.

Another main issue addressed in the current course was further simplifying and clarifying the examination. The debate assignment was also somewhat altered to have a more clear structure. A wider variety of topics and populations was added, e.g. companionship during labour and birth, program planning & development in the context of LMIC.

A short feedback on group assignments was provided by the teachers.

## Summary of the students’ response to the course valuation

* Response frequency was nearly 50%.
* The students ranked most of the course elements rather high, in particular scores between 4.6-4.8 were given for achieving intended learning outcomes, developing valuable skills/expertise, promoting scientific way of reasoning, teachers’ openness to the students’ ideas and opinions, including with regards to web-based teaching, clear instructions about we-based systems, like Canvas and an overall good atmosphere in the class.
* The students were also positive (4.1-4.3) about the digital learning environment, the improved ability to communicate orally and in writing, demands of the course, as well as equal learning opportunities for all students.
* Somewhat lower scores (3.9) concerned the time for reflection, including reflection about ethical issues.
* The students wished for even more clarity for the home exam, and some found the demands for the home exam rather high.
* The students wished for even a wider variety of topics (for example infectious disease)
* Overall, the students were rather pleased with classroom-based teaching and learning, even though they wished to join the offered Zoom lectures from their preferred location

## 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?*

Students were asked to share their pre-knowledge and course expectations during the first course day when both Lydia Kwak and myself were present. During the lectures and particularly group seminars the students had an opportunity to share their experiences from their work life, methodological skills etc.

Addressing the theory-practice gap was another expectation that was covered throughout the course.

* *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 course is set up with a combination of lectures and group work which was appreciated by many students. The group work provided the student with the opportunity to explore the content of the lecture in more detail and apply the knowledge they have gained through lectures. The group work also provided an opportunity for students’ interactions with each other and with the teacher.
* Student presence was high, nearly 100%, during the compulsory course elements, and somewhat lower during the non-compulsory parts.
* Student engagement was rather high both during lectures, asking questions and reflecting on the lecture’s content but also during group work, sharing their knowledge and experiences with the peers.
* The debate as the last group assignment was one of the course’s highlights, according to the students, giving them an opportunity to practice argumentation skills and oral communication. It also facilitated critical thinking and student interaction.
* The students wished for more time allocated for reading/ reflecting on the course literature.
* *How has the course worked with -constructive alignment - from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content?*

All lectures are reviewed to link to the learning outcomes, the content of each lecture and how they align with learning outcomes are detailed on Canvas for the students. Alignment was also enhanced by sharing instruction to all teachers about the learning outcomes and the course literature, and by discussions among teachers in the HPP track. Home-examination was linked to the content of both lectures and group work and all learning objectives. The course leader was present during most of the lectures to review the content of the lectures and alignment.

* *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.)*

Most of the group assignments involved peer-review and the assignment was thereafter discussed in class. The students wished for all of the group assignments to have a peer-review element to them.

The home examination was linked to the content and the learning outcomes of the course, and the home examination facilitated in-depth learning and understanding of the content of the course. Compared with the previous years, the examination was made clearer and had a more simple structure, yet was still experienced as demanding by some of the students. The new for this year is that one of the exam days fell on sports day, so the exam was shortened to 2 days instead of 3, and the content adjusted accordingly (e.g. 5 questions instead of 7).

## Course leader’s conclusions and suggestions for improvement

It is necessary to make some changes next course session in consideration of the students’ evaluation:

* Instructions for home-examination can be made even clearer, esp. with regards to technicalities, deadline in Canvas, assessment criteria etc.
* Review in advance the schedule, esp. the examination days, as sports day may come before/in between requiring additional adjustments.
* Allow more time for reading the course literature in the course schedule.
* Review the format of feedback on the debate assignment.
* Continuously review the course content for discussions about ethical issues.

#### Other comments

-