



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 4FH094	Course title Epidemiological Methods for Outcome Evaluation of Public Health Interventions	Credits 10 hp
Semester Fall 25	Period 20250915-20251029	

Course leader Johan Åhlén	Examiner Johan Åhlén
Other participating teachers Rosaria Galanti, Sigrid Elfström, Albin Isaksson, Karima Assel, Malachi Ochieng Arunda, Gergö Hadlakzky, Filipa Sampaio	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 54 i Ladok. 56 fick enkäten.	Number who have not completed the course¹ 1	Number passed after regular session² 43
Methods for student influence other than course survey³ Orally, at the last lecture, students were to discuss two and two about "strength" and "possible improvements", and then discuss in whole class. Continuously during the course I encouraged student to reflect on out exercises and possible improvement of these.		

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

The course was highly appreciated by students, who praised its structure, scientific approach, and supportive learning environment. The examination task of writing a study protocol was considered relevant and practical, though demanding for the examiner. Students valued formative evaluations and interactive elements but noted that workshops were sometimes too lecture-oriented. They suggested more active learning, smaller preparatory assignments, and hands-on statistical exercises with real data. Examples of completed evaluation protocols and clearer guidance for assignments were requested. Guest lectures varied in quality, and reducing their number was recommended. Improvements include distributing formative feedback throughout the course, making workshops more interactive, and refining weekly structure. Specific areas to strengthen are sample size calculations, policy evaluation methods, and outcome selection. Overall, many students described this as one of the best courses in the program.

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

Several changes were implemented to increase interactivity and better align teaching methods with learning goals:

- Ensured that workshops were truly interactive rather than lecture-based, incorporating structured peer feedback and group work.
- Used a course analysis tool (scope and sequence mapping) to identify lectures suitable for conversion into interactive sessions or complemented by workshops.
- Replaced or redesigned selected guest lectures to improve alignment with course objectives and ensure higher quality.
- Introduced hands-on activities for statistical topics, including exercises with real data to strengthen applied skills.
- Incorporated case-based learning elements, allowing students to work on real-world scenarios and draft sections of evaluation protocols.
- Enhanced formative feedback opportunities by integrating peer review and structured reflection during workshops.

Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

Survey

Students were very positive overall. Ratings were consistently high, with most items scoring between **5.2 and 5.8 on a 6-point scale**. The strongest ratings were for:

- *"The course provided opportunities for active learning"* (mean 5.8)
- *"There was a good atmosphere during the course"* (mean 5.7)
- *"I felt included and respected"* (mean 5.7)
- *"All students were provided with the same learning opportunities"* (mean 5.7)

Other high scores included *"The demands of the course were reasonable"* (mean 5.6) and *"I had enough time to reflect on what I learned"* (mean 5.4). The lowest rating was for *"My ability to communicate around the subject, both orally and in writing has increased during the course."* (mean 5.2), which, while positive, was slightly lower than other areas.

Summary of open-text feedback:

1. Johan was praised for creating an inclusive and supportive environment, learning all students' names, and encouraging participation.
2. Students appreciated interactive formative evaluations and opportunities for discussion.
3. The course was described as one of the best in the program, with strong structure and clear alignment to learning outcomes.
4. Suggested improvements included:
 - More individual guidance on assignments and Q&A time
 - Additional practical exercises and diverse case examples
 - Shorter lectures and clearer instructions
 - Better organization of Canvas and pre-reading materials
5. Some comments noted that formative evaluations could be more structured to ensure preparation.
6. Ethical aspects were perceived as less emphasized compared to other topics.

Oral feedback session

See also a summary of the oral feedback (Keep & Change for next year)

Keep:

- Interactive discussions between class and teacher
- Study-visit at CES
- Morning schedule (lectures pre-lunch)
- Formative evaluations with preparation
- Personal engagement ("knowing you")

Change:

- Make case work continuity clearer
- Include broader examples
- Reinforce reading by asking questions on assigned texts
- Add content on stepped-wedge and interrupted time series designs

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?*
- *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.)*

This was the second time I was responsible for the course. This time, it was easier to find an appropriate level on teaching, with more knowledge on students' previous knowledge. However, just like last year, I engaged with students, seeking their feedback on content and format. The course was appreciated, with students integrating theories and methodology into designing a study for outcome evaluation.

This year, formative evaluations and workshops were more clearly built on active participation, and interactive teaching. This was appreciated. However, some areas of improvement are to make more structured preparations for formative evaluations and workshops, as noted by some.

The learning outcomes is relatively well-defined and the examination (writing a study protocol) aligns well with these outcomes and effectively tests the required skills. The study protocol examination is a practical and appropriate task, mirroring what students may encounter in research roles.

However, just like last year, the examination process is quite demanding for me as an examiner due to the extensive reading and assessment required. Furthermore, students' probable use of AI (in addition to language editing) is a challenge, which speaks for potentially change examination form.

This year, I believe the formative evaluations better aligned with the weekly lectures and workshops.

Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

The course was highly appreciated, with strong ratings for active learning, inclusivity, and overall structure. Interactive workshops and formative evaluations were successful, and the examination task aligns well with learning outcomes. However, improvements are needed in the following areas:

- Structured preparation for formative evaluations and workshops.
- Additional practical exercises and diverse case scenarios to strengthen applied skills.
- Better organization of Canvas and pre-reading materials for easier navigation.
- Reinforce reading engagement by integrating questions on assigned texts.
- Expand content on stepped-wedge, regression discontinuity, and interrupted time series designs.
- Consider alternative examination formats to reduce examiner workload and address challenges related to AI-assisted writing.

Other comments