Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4NT015	Monitoring of non-communicable diseases, large scale data collection, analysis and data visualizations	7
Semester	**Period**	
Spring - 2026	First period (19 Jan – 17 Feb)	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Ioannis Ioakeimidis	Magdalena Rosell
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**
Ioannis Ioakeimidis	Christina Alexandrou, Billy Langlet, Vasileios Papapanagiotou, Emma Patterson, Sofia Spolander, Fernanda Roca, Kosmas Dimitropoulos, Anders Eriksson, Christos Diou, Poorna Anandavadivelan, Nina Kägi-Braun, Ionas Pagkalos, Eduardo Illueca Fernandez

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
31	-	77%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Oral discussions with participants during the course. Custom evaluation form inquiring about the quality and relevance of specific lectures Oral course evaluation with the student representatives after the end of the course		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students The students were informed via an announcement in Canvas		

1. Description of any conducted changes since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students

The course is given for the 4th time overall (3rd with the same, extended, duration of 7 credits). This year the duration of the course was kept similar as last year and the content of the course has been adapted based on the last years evaluation, seeking to achieve a better balance between nutritional epidemiology and applied practical data visualisation and analysis training, using Excel and R Studio. This year, based on the last year's feedback from the students, we did not teach Python programming, but the learning outcomes remained largely the same, with minor adaptations in phrasing.

Following the success of last year's examination, this year we kept the same format with only minor procedural changes: In summary, the composite examination was comprised by 4 smaller assignments that included: i) one group assignment (in class), ii) an individual assignment including peer-feedback and a second iteration of reporting, relevant to the theoretical content of the course, iii) another individual assignment relevant to the analytical skills taught in the course (these skills were also required for the completion of the individual thematic assignment) and iv) an oral presentation, relevant to the theoretical background of the course. Both the peer-evaluation component and the oral assignments were once more received favourably by the students (see comments in the evaluation report). Finally, we modified the list of the external guest lecturers, relevant to different domains of behavioural monitoring and population monitoring.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course

Overall, students were satisfied with the course, with the students expressing the opinion that the course provided opportunities for active learning on a satisfactory level (more than 78% agreed with this statement with more than 3 out of 6) and more than 70% evaluated as being "good as a whole". A big improvement in comparison to the previous year was that the amount of effort/week was evaluated favourably and there was almost homogenous agreement that the final exam (the oral component) provided learning opportunities. These points above were confirmed through the oral discussions and the oral course evaluation with the student representatives, but there were still some comments on the balance between theoretical and practical teaching (i.e., epidemiological knowledge vs data analytics) that can be improved next year.

3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

Strengths of the course: Overall, the course was improved in comparison with the last year across the board. This year I feel that we improved even more on our main goal from last year's evaluation, namely, to integrate better the nutritional theme with the data analytics, creating a more homogeneous learning experience. We also managed to focus on more specific data analysis tools, favouring more extensive trainings in R Studio and Excel, rather than more advanced teaching of programming in Python, that was appreciated by th3e students. The newly invited external lecturers were well received and the same was the case for the ones that remained unchanged from last year (based on lecture-specific evaluations collected through a targeted evaluation form that was distributed to the class). Again, the students seemed to appreciate the format of the exams, especially the oral presentation in the format of student-created scientific articles. Finally, the reactivity and the feedback from the lecturers was also praised numerous times.

Weaknesses of the course: The students raised some issues for increasing interactivity in some of the more theoretical teaching components of the course, which is something relevant to examine going forward.

4. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

Based on the received feedback I conclude that the course has indeed improved and required minimal adjustments for next year. Specifically we will further balance the data analysis and computational teaching, trying to distribute it better to help less advanced students, improving the passing of the course. As we do, we will continue using standardised, nutrition-relevant, datasets asking the students to work on these throughout the course, but we have some additional ideas that will complement the public health and burden of disease components of the teaching. We will also continue to optimize the scope of the thematic components of the course according to specific feedback we received by students through the dedicated evaluation forms. The exam structure will be kept as is, since this is the component that seemed to resonate best with the students.