



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 4FH096	Course title Theories and methods for implementation and evaluation, 7 hp	Credits 7hp
Semester Fall 24	Period 2024-10-31—2024-12-02	

Course leader Liselotte Elinder Schäfer	Examiner Liselotte Elinder Schäfer
Other participating teachers Kristi Sidney Annerstedt, Ann Liljas, Åsa Norman, Emma Patterson, Jhon Alvarez Ahlgren, Anna Toropova, Annika Bäck, Leif Eriksson	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 16	Number who have not completed the course¹ 16	Number passed after regular session² 16
Methods for student influence other than course survey³ <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students were given the possibility to comment on the lectures and ask questions from the previous day/week. On the last day of the course, they were given the opportunity for 1 hour to give comments and feed-back.• No formal registration of response frequency		

¹At 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 2023

- Labeling the core reading and additional reading separately is something to improve.
- For the weekly assignments, the students want to know which group they will meet already on the day of the introduction to the assignment in order to read the PM of that specific group
- The lecture on process evaluation will be combined with the one on Qualitative methods in implementation research to reduce the number of external lecturers and face-to-face hours.

- I consider replacing the MINISTOP lecture with a general lecture on scaling up.
- In the evaluation lecture, I will use IMPROVE as the example.
- I did not manage to include a lecture or workshop specifically on ethical issues this year, when to implement and scale up an intervention and when to wait, when to de-implement ineffective programs or practices, the dilemma of untreated control groups etc. but will do that next year with a focus on the level of evidence and potential adverse effects.

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

- I have removed less important material from the reading list which means that all material given is core material – but I wonder if they read it?
- Students were informed from the start which group they would meet for the next seminar.
- The lecture on process evaluation was combined with the one on Qualitative methods in implementation research, which went well.
- Some less popular lectures were removed to reduce costs.
- Lecture on “Outcomes measurement” now uses the IMPROVE study as an example.
- Ethical issues were discussed in several lectures but could be improved.

Summary of the students’ response to the course evaluation

- The students again appreciate the structure of the schedule.
- The students were somewhat less satisfied with the course than last year as judged by lower scores on almost all questions. Only max half of them turned up at the lectures, except for the mandatory sessions. In general, they seemed less engaged than last year, except for a few individuals. Some asked for more interaction in the classroom.
- They did not like the room LOUIS and some blamed their absence on the room being dark and unpleasant.
- Some students commented that there was some overlap with other courses.
- The seminars and group discussions were again very popular. But there was a suggestion for change. The questions were too specific considering that they had to turn off the computer and mobile during the discussion.
- The extra lecture on budgeting of a project given by Kristi was popular and well attended and should be included in the schedule next year.
- Students found the home examination demanding, but all of them passed.

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?*
 - Overall, the students were satisfied with the course although less than the previous years. They think that this course builds nicely on the previous one. All passed the home examination. The students learn the foundations for implementation research and can build on that knowledge when continuing to work with complex interventions for their thesis.
 - *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)*
- Each of the 5 weeks has its own theme and the same structure, which is highly appreciated. The lectures are given by researchers in the field and in addition the students have access to webinars with renowned international scientists as additional support. However, this year the number of lectures was reduced to lower the costs. Less than half of the students attended regularly, which meant that it was difficult to be very interactive. The lecture on hybrid studies and food systems provided a good opportunity for interactivity, but not many

students attended. For the 4 assignments, students divide themselves into four groups. First, they discuss and answer the questions in the assignment together in the group. On the day of peer-review they first discuss their answers with another group before discussing the assignment all together in class, where they sit in a circle, which is highly appreciated. At the end of the course, I had scheduled one hour for feedback and reflections.

- *How has the course worked with -constructive alignment - from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content?*
According to students' responses, the content of the course is well aligned with the learning outcomes, although a bit lower than last year.
- *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.)*
Examination is done through 4 group assignments with compulsory participation where students critically analyze different aspects of implementation research (the need for reporting guidelines, identification of barriers and facilitators, choice of implementation strategies and evaluation of implementation studies). The 3-day individual home examination gives them the opportunity to reflect on their own of what they have learned. The examination is also based on a complex intervention, where students have to identify structural elements and reflect on strengths and weaknesses and suggest improvements. In general, the students perform well with about 50% achieving PwD and no one failed. The questions posed both in the group assignments and the home examination complement each other and reflect the ILO's to a large extent.

Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

- Take up ethical aspects and dilemmas in all/most of the lectures
- Check final home assignment with colleague for clarity and magnitude/scope
- Instruct all teachers to be more interactive and leave room for questions, maybe flip the classroom.
- The lecture on measurement can be reduced to two hours, overlapping with previous course. Check with Johan Åhlen.
- Students would like to learn more about One Health. Include next year.
- Include an example of adaptation of an intervention in new contexts, preferably from other parts of the world.
- Take a look at the seminar questions to ensure they are creating discussion. Should we give them a different set of questions to discuss when they come together?
- Include the lecture on budgeting of a project next year.

Other comments

- Ask for a classroom with windows!

Liselotte Schäfer Elinder