

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4TX031	Course title Health Risk Assessment	Credits 9
Semester (VT/HT-year) VT26		

Course director/examiner Anna Beronius	Other teacher(s) responsible for major part(s) (if applicable) Linda Schenk, course co-lead
--	---

Number of registered students (at 3-week check) 28	Number of students that passed at end of course (after regular session) 27	Response rate in KI survey (%) 75
Other methods for influence by students (besides KI survey) course council		
How and when is feedback of KI survey results given to students? Course survey and course analysis uploaded on course web. Major results presented to next group of students at introduction of course		

1. Description of any changes made since last course event (based on for example feedback from previous students)

Based on feedback from students in the previous year that it would be good to get more overview of the risk assessment process early in the course, we added an introductory exercise to review and discuss a risk assessment report in the first week of the course.

2. Brief summary of the KI survey

(Based on students' quantitative answers and major feedback from free-text answers)

Students' feedback was very positive! Hands-on practical learning, the group work on a risk assessment case, and study visits were among the aspects students especially brought up as specific strengths of the course. Several students also commented that they appreciated the diversity of learning activities in the course, providing an opportunity to learn complex concepts and processes in different ways.

KI or programme-specific question	Average result (1= totally disagree, 6= totally agree)
The course was designed in a way that provided me with opportunities for active learning.	5.9
I felt included and respected during the course.	5.9
The course as a whole was good.	5.8
To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded? (1= far too little, 2= too little, 3= appropriate, 4= too much, 5= far too much)	3.1
When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	5.8

3. Course director's reflections on the course and the results, the conclusions and suggestions for changes:

(to be published on the course web)

The course worked very well and the students were overall very positive. Students participated actively in learning activities and performed very well in the oral and written examinations. It is specifically noted that the inclusion of individual assignments to prepare for group work improves the quality of group assignments and discussions and is very much appreciated by the students. The newly added introductory exercise to review and discuss a risk assessment report in the first week of the course was well received but can be further improved next year to utilise the time better and structure the discussions. Students provided constructive suggestions for learning activities linked to chemicals regulation and regulatory risk assessment, which we will consider for next year. The workload in the course seems appropriate but to some extent unevenly distributed over the weeks. This is partly due to availability of teachers but is something that will be considered in the scheduling of next course.

There will be some changes to the next course due to the new Programme Syllabus introduced in fall 2026. For example, addition of more aspects of chemicals regulation and evidence appraisal moved from other courses.
