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 4FH082	Course title Methods for studying the distribution of health	Credits 7.5
Semester HT25	Period 25-10-06—25-11-07	

Course leader **Olena Gruzieva, co-course leader Jeroen de Bont**	Examiner **Olena Gruzieva**
Other participating teachers **Olena Gruzieva (OG)**, Associate professor, Institute of Environmental Medicine (IMM), KI. olena.gruzieva@ki.se (co-course leader) **Jeroen de Bont (JdB)**, Assistant Professor, IMM, KI. jeroen.de.bont@ki.se (co-course leader) **Andreas Lundin (AL)**, PhD, Dept. Global Public Health, KI. andreas.lundin@ki.se **Javier Louro** (JL), PhD, IMM, KI javier.louro@ki.se **Christina-Evmorfia Kampitsi (CEK),** PhD, IMM, KI christina.evmorfia.kampitsi@ki.se **Cornelia Santoso (CS),** PhD, IMM, KI cornelia.santoso@ki.se **Emmanuel Robesyn (ER), ECDC** Emmanuel.Robesyn@ecdc.europa.eu **Wooseong Kim (WK)**, IMM, KI wooseong.kim@ki.se	**Other participating teachers** **Eva Skillgate (ES)**, Professor, IMM, KI eva.skillgate@ki.se **Hanna Karlsson (HK),** Associate Professor, IMM, KI hanna.l.karlsson@ki.se **Miriam Elfström (ME)**, PhD, Department of Clinical Science, Intervention, and Technology, KI and Center for Cervical Cancer Elimination, Karolinska University Hospital. miriam.elfstrom@ki.se **Rickard Ljung (RL),** MD, Professor, IMM and Swedish Medical Products Agency rickard.ljung@ki.se **Sandra Ekström (SE),** PhD, IMM, KI sandra.ekstrom@ki.se **Shizhen He (SH),** PhD, IMM, KI shizhen.he@ki.se **Sven Drefahl (SD),** PhD, Stockholm University sven.drefahl@sociology.su.se **Suzanne Ruhe-van der Werff (SR),** PhD, Dept of Medicine, KI. suzanne.ruhe.van.der.werff@ki.se **Zhebin Yu (ZY)**, Assistant Professor, IMM, KI. zhebin.yu@ki.se

Number of registered students 55	Number who have not completed the course[1] 2	Number passed after regular session[2] 53

Methods for student influence other than course survey[3]

Regular morning recap sessions and weekly reviews were conducted throughout the course, providing opportunities for questions and immediate feedback from students. In addition, ongoing interactions with the course leaders — both in person and via email— enabled timely adjustments to the course delivery as needed. Finally, all students who attended the "Wrap-up and Evaluation" session at the end of the course were invited to share feedback and propose improvements for future course iterations.

[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

Overall, the students seem to be satisfied with the course. There are areas that may benefit from some modification, based primarily on feedback given in the oral course evaluation as well as via the course evaluation survey (elaborated on below).

Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

Together with participating teachers, we have made some modifications to the content of several lectures. For instance, we tried to add a more global perspective, as well as include examples of how to use epidemiological methods to study environmental aspects, including climate change. Noteworthy, due to large number of students (n=55), we had to modify some of the group assignments to keep them feasible. For practical reasons, we conducted all, but one group works via Zoom to allow more efficient supervision by the teachers.

Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

Overall, the students seem to be satisfied with the course in terms of developing valuable expertise, alignment, achieving learning outcomes, and atmosphere.

More specifically,

- **Overall course rating:** Mean score 4.8 out of max 6 – majority of students agreed the course was good as a whole (mean score 4.8 out of max 6), and that there was a good atmosphere during the course (mean score 5.0), but some expressed dissatisfaction with structure and organization.
- **Active learning opportunities:** Highly rated (mean 5.2); most students appreciated group work and interactive elements, though some found group work excessive and preferred more seminars or individual tasks.
- **Inclusion and respect:** Strongly positive (mean 5.2); most felt respected and comfortable, though a few noted time pressure during assignment presentations.
- **Learning outcomes:**
    - Communication skills improved (mean 4.9).
    - Ethical reflection scored lower (mean 4.6); several comments indicated this was not a major focus.
- **Demands vs. outcomes:** Rated positively (mean 5.2), though some linked perceived difficulty to teaching quality.
- **Time for reflection:** Mixed (mean 4.8); some felt days were too long and intense.

As for suggestions for improvements, several students requested fewer group sessions and more time for self-study. Some comments highlighted lack of clarity in certain lectures, as well as limited integration of ethical discussions.

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.)*

We use a mix of lectures, group work and individual written assignments. For the final course workshop, the students could choose a topic based on their experience and interests. We have had a concept map over the fundamental concepts that the course is supposed to cover. We introduce this map during the first day and come back to it continuously during the course to make sure the students can follow how we gradually move forward through the map and cover concept by concept. By the end of every course week, there was an individual written diagnostic test that allows the course leader to see whether everyone is on board or whether some concepts need to be reviewed. It this way it is possible to assist students who needed additional support to ensure that no student is left behind. At the end of the course, we have a formal written examination focusing on the basic epidemiological concepts included in the course ILOs. Based on the results of the examination (the vast majority of students received "Pass with distinction" grade), it seems that this approach is efficient.

I am overall satisfied with how the course was delivered and received by the students. There has been a constant participation of the majority of the students in class, both for the morning lectures and afternoon group works, even in the non-mandatory sessions. Many of the students appreciated morning reviews, weekly mandatory assignments, as well as lecture notes and solutions to exercises that were shared on Canvas. This positive feedback has been used to confirm that we should keep these practices. Group works were sometimes challenging given large number of students and remote supervision, so we may need to revisit the set-up for the next year in case as many students are anticipated next time. Further, some lectures were perceived as confusing, with heavy reliance on slides and unanswered questions. Students requested clearer explanations, more visuals, and timely follow-up on queries.

Course leaders' conclusions and suggestions for improvement

The course met its learning objectives for most students, but feedback indicates a need for better organization, reduced group work, and clearer communication. To address those needs, we will implement the following changes:

- Reduce group work frequency by replacing with individual assignments, provide group allocations for all planned group works already at course start.
- Enhance teaching clarity by revising selected lecture slides to incorporate more visuals and step-by-step examples, and maintain better tracking of timely follow-up on student queries.
- Integrate ethical reflection: Add dedicated time for discussing ethical issues in epidemiological research.
- Optimize time management: allow more time for reflection and self-study.
- Consider more in-person supervision of group assignments instead of Zoom to improve engagement and learning.

Other comments