Course evaluation

Course code **4FH098**	**Course title** Introduction to planning and program development	**Credits** 5 hp
Semester **VT26**	**Period** 2026-01-29 – 2026-02-20	

Course leader Anna Toropova	**Examiner** Lydia Kwak and Anna Toropova
Other participating teachers Lydia Kwak, Liselotte Schäfer Elinder, Gisela Nyberg, Josefin Edwall, Lisa Holmlund, Femke Van Nassau, Emmanuel Aboagye, Rita Bakesiima, Kristi Sydney Annerstedt	**Other participating teachers** **Group work:** Anna Toropova, Andreas Rödlund, Jeffrey Casely-Hayford

Number of registered students 23	**The number who have not completed the course**[1]	**Number passed after regular session**[2] 23
Methods for student influence other than course survey[3] During the course introduction the students are asked to share their educational/professional background as well as their expectations of the course allowing to make an initial assessment of their prerequisites. The course leader introduces overall course aim/learning outcomes, course literature, expectations from the students, organizational issues such as group work arrangement. A brief introduction of formative and summative assessment is made and practicalities like schedule, venues are also discussed. In addition, previous year course evaluation results and changes made based on the results analysis are shared with the students during the introductory session. During the course, the students are asked to give feedback on the course progress on a weekly basis, in group and individually if needed, and often right after the lecture/group assignment. A few days before the final exam, a presentation on the course examination is given where expectations/formalia are discussed, followed by Q&A session. The oral feedback and the formal course evaluation give important information regarding potential areas for course improvement. Response frequency in the current formal evaluation survey was 35%. Ongoing feedback on the program in general and particular courses is shared and discussed during the regular Program council meetings (4 times per term plus one full day meeting in August every year).		

[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 successful overall, with very high ratings on most of the course aspects. All students achieved the intended learning outcomes after the first summative assessment, with 7 students having passed with distinction.

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

The main change since the previous occasion was introduction of Inspera examination, which replaced an open-book home exam. The content and format (short-essay questions) of mid-term assessment was modified to enable students to prepare for the final examination. Final examination requirements were introduced to students several days before the exam, where a

presentation on the examination formalia including a Q&A session was held. In addition, a study guide containing the necessary knowledge and skills for the final examination was shared with students about a week before the exam (during their preparation for the mid-term assessment). Finally, KIB sessions on academic writing and peer review were introduced in the course this year.

Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

- Response rate of 35%
- The majority of the students rated most of the course aspects very high, including opportunities for active learning, being included and respected in the course, equal learning opportunities for all students, enough time to reflect on things learned during the course, teachers' openness to the students' ideas and opinions, clear instructions about web-based systems, including with regards to web-based teaching, reasonable demands of the course and an overall good atmosphere in the class.
- A few students wished for more time to prepare for group work tasks and peer-review as well as for the mid-term assignment
- While the student felt that there was enough time to reflect on things learned during the course, reflection on ethical issues raised during the course appears to need even more room
- Overall, the students appreciated classroom-based teaching and learning, allowing for high level of engagement in the course. The three Zoom lectures allowing international lecturers to be involved were also appreciated for being scheduled closer to the end of the course, allowing for more flexibility.
- The open-ended responses included requests for more diversity of public health issues to be covered in the course, a higher degree of alignment between course activities, clearer examination assessment criteria, and information about the final examination requirements provided at an even earlier stage.

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?*
- At the introductory session involving both course leader and the examiner, the students were asked to share their previous knowledge, professional experiences and course expectations. During the lectures and particularly group seminars the students had an opportunity to share their opinions/experiences on various public health issues with peer groups and the whole class.

- *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)*

- Course learning activities include a combination of lectures, group/peer work and self-directed learning, which is continuously appreciated by most students. The group work, including peer review of the mid-term assessment, aimed to provide the students with the opportunity to both work together in a collaborative manner as well as give each other feedback on the completed tasks.

- As during previous course occasions, student attendance was high during compulsory sessions, while attendance during non-compulsory sessions was lower.
- Student engagement was rather high during lectures, with active reflections on the lecture's content and engagement with the lecturer. During group work sessions, all the students participated in preparing, presenting and peer-reviewing group assignments.
- Mid-term assessment involved peer review of the problem theory justification paper written by the students, which was an efficient method to both assess and learn from each other via peer feedback.
- During this year's course occasion, two library sessions on academic writing and providing peer review were organized by KIB, facilitating student preparation of both individual (mid-term assessment) and group learning activities, as well as preparation for the final examination

- *How has the course worked with -constructive alignment - from learning outcomes to examination form and examination content?*

  Course activities are continuously reviewed in relation to their alignment with the learning outcomes, with information on the learning objectives of the activities are presented Canvas and at the start of each of the activities. Alignment is regularly discussed with course teachers with regards to content, learning outcomes and the course literature, as well as with program teachers during program council meetings. Mid-term assessment and final examinations are linked to the content of both lectures and group work as well as to course learning objectives.

- *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.)*
- Group assignments involve peer-review process, and the assignment is discussed in class during the final half-hour of the session. Brief written feedback is given on the assignment to each group by the instructor responsible.
- The goal of mid-term assessment is to ensure that all students are reaching learning outcomes and to identify students in need of extra support. It requires application of student critical thinking, encouraging student in-depth learning on one hand, and ensuring they have reached the course learning outcomes half-way through the course. The assignment is also a building block for final examination, with the knowledge required for mid-term assessment essential for answering examination questions. The assignment is peer-assessed, which encourages application of the knowledge gained in the course not only to do their assignment but also to assess their peers' knowledge/understanding.
- The final examination is aligned with the overall course content and the learning outcomes, assessed on a points system translated into 'Fail', 'Pass' and 'Pass with distinction'.

Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement

Students' evaluations are important to inform further course improvement, with some of the potential changes before the next course administration involving:

- More time should be allowed for student preparation of group assignments, mid-term assessment and related peer-reviews; as well as reflection time on ethical and other related issues
- Further alignment of mid-term assessment with the course overall and final examination in particular, both in terms of content and timeframe, should be done

- Final examination instructions and assessment criteria can be introduced at an even earlier stage in the course, with assessment criteria revised for more clarity and potentially a more nuanced grading scale

Other comments