# 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**  **4FH086** | **Course title**  **Epidemiological methods for studying the determinants of health** | **Credits**  **7,5** |
| **Semester**  **VT23** | **Period**  **May – June** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course leader**  **Karin Modig** | **Examiner**  **Karin Modig** |
| **Other participating teachers** | **Other participating teachers**  **MF= Maria Feychting,**  **ES= Eva Skillgate,**  **GT= Giorgio Tettamanti,**  **HM= Hanna Mogensen,**  **EM=Christina-Evmorfia Kampitsi,**  **AM=Anna Meyer,**  **AnM=Anthony Matthews,**  **KG=Katalin Gémes,**  **SE=Stina Ek,**  **MD=Mozhu Ding,**  **XX=Xin Xia** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of registered students**  46 | **Number who have not completed the course1** | **Number passed after regular session2** |
| **Methods for student influence other than course survey3**   * how the students were given the opportunity to participate in the preparation and decisions at course level,   Not participate, but they gave feedback during and after the course. The students also have two student representatives, which are present during planning phase and discussions at the program meetings at the Department of Global Public Health.   * 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,   Students are giving feedback orally and in written form during and after the course, as well as in written form in the evaluation.   * 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).   56,5% answer frequency on the written evaluation. | | |

## 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

* *Insert reflections from previous course evaluation.*
* The home exam was too extensive, also covered the same things repeatedly
* Somewhat different views on definitions among the teachers
* Some students report they want more statistics before this course.
* Quizzes were good.

## Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

We replaced a couple of articles to be reviewed to broaden the perspectives of global health. Especially we replaced the article for the cohort seminar since this caused confusion for some students because of its advanced statistics.

I was clearer with the expectations of the individual assignment and provided some written and concrete examples of how to write and what is required in order to pass.

We included a possibility to add questions or comments anonymously in the lecture quizzes at Canvas and brought them up during the seminar following the lecture.

I replaced the guest lecture from Covid to placebo effect in epidemiological and clinical studies.

We made one session of teachers time before exam, combining case control and cohort teachers, in order for students to ask questions during one session, and in order for teachers to communicate coherently.

For the exam, we separated the time for when to write the pass part and when to write the distinction part.

We changed the oral presentation of the assignment, so that the students were asked to argue more for one of the designs than the other. This made the seminars more interactive.

## 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.*
* Overall it was good. 96% reported that they had developed valuable expertise/skills during the course to a large or very large extent. The results were slightly better than the previous year.

Written comments from the students were in general very positive. Most students seem to appreciate the pre-recorded lectures and the more interactive sessions at Campus., even if some state that they want more in person lectures at campus.

## 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?*
* *See changes described above*
* *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)*
* *How has the course worked with -constructive alignment - from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content?*
* *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.)*
* All examinations focus on interpretation and application of the content learned during lectures and course material. It is a mix of group discussions and individual assignments. All assignments are put in the order of when brought up during the course to get alignment, and it is a progress in terms of level.

## Course leader’s conclusions and suggestions for improvement

It is clear that most students are happy with the course, and a few are not satisfied. We had a problem with poor participation in campus seminars. This was a real pity considering that they are very important in order to discuss and reflect on aspects brought up in the recorded lectures.

Some students report that they only to a small extent had enough time to reflect on what they have learned. I think this might coincide with not being present on all the activities.

The results for an opportunity to reflect on ethical issues were lower than the results o other questions. I agree that we do not spend much time on this. I would like to, but it is already som much content in the course that I don’t know how to squeeze it in. I will think if it could be included in the individual assignment for example.

The results from the exam were overall good, even if some students failed. We offer one re-exam within the course and most students reached pass on this exam, one even got pass with distinction. The time of the course, at the end of the semester, is likely one explanation of why few students attend the seminar rehearsal that we offer some time after the exam. This is a pity since this is a good opportunity for learning. However, we post the slides at Canvas for the students to go through themselves.

We have a teachers' meeting after the course and after having read the evaluation. During this meeting we concluded that for the year 2024 we shall not book the room Atrium as it suited poorly for interactive sessions with students, but instead book a wider lecture room with smaller tables if possible.

Moreover, we will ask the students to send in questions after the lectures, this is to see that they have watched the lectures, and to make the seminars more interactive. It will, however, not be mandatory to do so.

The exam will be at Campus instead of a home exam.

#### Other comments