# 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**  **HT24** | **Period**  **24-10-07—24-11-08** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course leader**  **Olena Gruzieva** | **Examiner**  **Olena Gruzieva** |
| **Other participating teachers**  **Olena Gruzieva (OG)**, Associate professor, Institute of Environmental Medicine (IMM), KI. [olena.gruzieva@ki.se](mailto:olena.gruzieva@ki.se) (course leader)  **Andreas Lundin (AL)**, PhD, Dept. Global Public Health, KI. [andreas.lundin@ki.se](mailto:andreas.lundin@ki.se)  **Anna Maria Lampousi (AML),** PhD, IMM, KI [annamaria.lampousi@ki.se](mailto:annamaria.lampousi@ki.se)  **Charlotta Eriksson (CE),** PhD, IMM, KI [charlotta.eriksson@ki.se](mailto:charlotta.eriksson@ki.se)  **Christina-Evmorfia Kampitsi (CEK),** PhD, IMM, KI [christina.evmorfia.kampitsi@ki.se](mailto:christina.evmorfia.kampitsi@ki.se)  **Emmanuel Robesyn (ER), ECDC** Emmanuel.Robesyn@ecdc.europa.eu  **Eva Skillgate (ES)**, Professor, IMM, KI [eva.skillgate@ki.se](mailto:eva.skillgate@ki.se)  **Hanna Karlsson (HK),** Associate Professor, IMM, KI [hanna.l.karlsson@ki.se](mailto:hanna.l.karlsson@ki.se)  **Jeroen de Bont (JdB)**, PhD, IMM, KI. jeroen.de.bont@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](mailto:miriam.elfstrom@ki.se)  **Rickard Ljung (RL),** MD, Professor, IMM and Swedish Medical Products Agency [rickard.ljung@ki.se](mailto:rickard.ljung@ki.se)  **Sven Drefahl (SD),** PhD, Stockholm University [sven.drefahl@sociology.su.se](mailto:sven.drefahl@sociology.su.se)  **Suzanne Ruhe-van der Werff** **(SR),** PhD, Dept of Medicine, KI. [suzanne.ruhe.van.der.werff@ki.se](mailto:suzanne.ruhe.van.der.werff@ki.se)  **Zhebin Yu (ZY)**, PhD, IMM, KI. zhebin.yu@ki.se | **Other participating teachers** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of registered students**  **59** | **Number who have not completed the course1**  **3** | **Number passed after regular session2**  **56** |
| **Methods for student influence other than course survey3**  Regular morning review sessions and weekly reviews with the students were carried out throughout the course allowing for questions and immediate feedback from the class. Regular interactions with the course leader both in person and by email allowed to modify along the way how the course was carried forward. Further, all students attending the “Wrap-up and evaluation” session at the end of the course had the opportunity to provide feedback and suggest improvements and topics that they would like to see covered. | | |

## 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).
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## 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 SDGs aspects, as well as include examples of how to use epidemiological methods to study environmental aspects, including climate change. Further, based on students´ request, we have shortened the group work concerning infectious disease epidemiology. Noteworthy, this year we had more students (n=60), therefore we had to modify some of the group assignments to keep them feasible. For practical reasons, we conducted all 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, 78% of respondents to the course evaluation reported that in their view they had developed valuable expertise/skills to a large extent or very large extent, and 83% felt they achieved the intended learning outcomes of the course to a large extent or very large extent. Also, the majority reported that the course had promoted their scientific way of thinking and reasoning to a large extent or very large extent (81%). Further, over 70% of the respondents felt that everyone was provided with the same learning opportunities during the course to a large or a very large extent.

The majority of students felt that the demands were reasonable in relation to the learning outcomes to a large or very large extent (89%); while two students felt the demands were reasonable to a small extent. At the same time, 19% of the respondents considered that they did not have enough time to reflect on what they have learned.
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## 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” grades), 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. 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.

## Course leader’s conclusions and suggestions for improvement

We are interested in including more lecturers with a global perspective, based on our own and the students’ feedback. Further, several students suggested some of the group exercises could have been less, especially the ones which included calculations, thus we will discuss with other engaged teachers regarding the possibility to replace some of those with individual assignments. We will try to allocate more time for reflection and individual reading. We are also considering a way to provide more opportunities for reflecting on ethical issues and discussions on how to act in diverse situations. Also, we will try to provide a clearer link between certain lectures and the learning outcomes of the course.

#### Other comments