# 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****HT23** | **Period****23-10-02—23-11-05** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 (course leader)**Alexandra Wennberg (AW),** PhD, IMM, KI. alexandra.wennberg@ki.se **Andreas Lundin (AL)**, PhD, Dept. Global Public Health, KI. andreas.lundin@ki.se**Anna Meyer (AM),** PhD, IMM, KI. anna.meyer@ki.se**Charlotta Eriksson (CE),** PhD, IMM, KI charlotta.eriksson@ki.se**Eva Skillgate (ES)**, Professor, Sophiahemmet University and IMM, KI eva.skillgate@ki.se**Hanna Karlsson (HK),** Associate Professor, IMM, KI**Jeroen de Bont (JdB)**, PhD, IMM, KI. jeroen.de.bont@ki.se**Juliana Reyes (JR),** PhD, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Juliana.Reyes@ecdc.europa.eu**Maria Feychting (MF)**, Professor, IMM, KI maria.feychting@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**Marios Rossides (MR),** PhD, IMM, KI, marios.rossides@ki.se**Rickard Ljung (RL),** MD, Professor, IMM and Swedish Medical Products Agency rickard.ljung@ki.se**Stina Ek (SEk),** PhD, IMM, KI. stina.ek@ki.se**Suzanne Ruhe-van der Werff** (SR), PhD, Dept of Medicine, KI. suzanne.ruhe.van.der.werff@ki.se**Zhebin Yu (ZY)**, PhD, IMM, KI. zhebin.yu@ki.se | **Other participating teachers** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of registered students****40** | **Number who have not completed the course1**  | **Number passed after regular session2** **34** |
| **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).



## 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 (elaborated on below).

## Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

Together with participating teachers, we have modified the course based on student feedback. For instance, we have cut down on group work in favor of individual work. Also, as suggested by the students, we tried to add a more global perspective as well as include SDGs aspects.

## 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, all 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 89% 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 (93%). Further, all 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 three students felt the demands were reasonable to some extent.



## 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 assignments. For several of the workshops, the students could choose a topic based on their experience and interests. We have 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 is 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 adjust the pace of the course to the students’ needs and to ensure that no student is left behind. At the end of the course, we have a formal written examination focusing on the basic concepts. Based on the results of the examination, 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 work. Many of the students appreciated morning reviews, weekly mandatory assignments, afternoon group works, 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.

## 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. We are also considering a way to include more about sustainability and examples of how to use epidemiology to study health effects of climate change. We will also try to allocate more time for reflection and individual reading. The topic of bias will also be given more time in next year´s schedule. Also, we will provide a clearer link between certain lectures and the learning outcomes of the course.

#### Other comments