

The course report is an important instrument for the development of courses and programmes, as well as for guaranteeing student influence. The structure for course evaluation is described in *Riktlinjer för kursutvärderingsprocessen* (LED 1.3-2018/123) and in *Rutiner för kursvärderingar och kursrapporter för hälsa och samhälle* (LED 1.3-2016/187). The course report shall contain background information/key indicators, a summary of the students' course evaluations, as well as an analysis and action plan.

**The course report is compiled after each completed (full) course**

**Course administrator**

Name	Date
Maria	190411

**Background information (to be completed by the course administrator)**

<b>Course name</b>		
Criminality and Ill-health		
<b>Course code</b>	<b>Scope (credits)</b>	<b>Semester in which the course is completed</b>
KA721E	7,5 hp	VT19
<b>Specify a single subject course or contract education (if the course has been completed within a programme, specify the programme name)</b>		
Criminology, Master's Programme		
<b>Course coordinator</b>		<b>Number of registered students</b>
Linn Persson		

**Student's perspective (to be completed if possible by the course administrator, in other cases by the course coordinator)**

<b>Formative course evaluation</b> type of course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
<p>Oral evaluations were done during lectures and journal clubs during the course. The teacher got feedback from students regarding course material (the critical review form) in which students expressed difficulties using the material. The teacher addressed the issue in the beginning of a lecture, and afterwards the students understood better why and how the critical review forms should be used. Next time the course is held more time could be given to presenting and explaining the use of the critical review form during the introduction of the course, or perhaps changing the critical review form to one that better fits the literature of the course. Further, the seminar form of journal clubs, and meetings with the student who had led them also gave opportunities for students to give formative feedback during the course.</p>	
<b>Number of students who answered the formative course evaluation</b>	<b>Percentage response rate</b>
Around 25	Around 80%

<b>Summative course evaluation</b> (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
Questionnaire, 190221 - 190301	
<b>Number of students who responded to summative course evaluation</b>	<b>Percentage response rate</b>
21	61,76

<b>Feedback to students: how (via email, canvas, dialogue in the classroom) and when the feedback was implemented</b>
Feedback was given to students via messages on Canvas, at the same time as they got their feedback and results on their Public Outreach Papers.

**Teacher's perspective (to be completed by the course coordinator)**

<p><b>Results:</b> Comments on the course implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' actual learning outcomes in relation to the course's intended learning outcomes are summarised here (incl. information regarding the result of the examination). Both success factors and problems are identified</p>
<p>In the course, there are two different examination assessments, orally in Journal Clubs and written in a Public Outreach Paper. Both of the assessment forms were seen to work well. A great majority of the students were very active in the journal clubs and expressed satisfaction and joy with that form of mandatory seminar. The students had some small issues to understand how a critical review form should be filled in before each journal club (as a way to familiarize themselves with the literature), but after in-class discussions and further directions from the course coordinator the students found it easier. The Public Outreach Paper was also an appreciated examination form. The students were engaged and expressed that they thought it was fun and different (in a good way) from other examinations to write. For the first time since the course was established they had a lecture/workshop on how to do Public Outreaches, which most likely also helped them to achieve the learning outcomes assessed by the Public Outreach Paper. The students thus had no overall problem to reach the learning outcomes (in relation to the examination forms) which their grades also showed (D=3, C=11, B=12, A=4). However, a small number (2) of students could not come to any of the mandatory Journal Clubs which is not ideal to idea of it is based on active learning and participation. To get these student to pass and reach the learning outcomes they had to do make-up assignments for each missed Journal Club. This is however not ideal in regard of the importance of oral and active participation in the seminars/Journal Clubs of the course, since written assignments can be seen to measure their knowledge in a different way. Thus, in the future of the course it should be addressed how missed mandatory seminars/journal clubs in the best way could be compensated for by students.</p>
<p><b>Analysis:</b> Analysis based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations – both formative as summative. Produced in collaboration with the teachers involved in the course; alternatively, the views of participating teachers are taken into account.</p>
<p>Based on the student's course evaluations the majority of the class was very satisfied with the course as a whole. In the summative evaluation the mean value was 5.1, sd= 0.9. The students expressed</p>

both formally and informally, that they thought that the course was both fun and that they learnt a lot from the course. From the summative evaluation it was seen that most student thought that the learning outcomes had been reached ( $m=5.2$ ,  $sd=0.7$ ). The students appreciated the Journal Clubs, many students told the course coordinator that during the course and some later wrote it in the formal course evaluation. They liked to address literature and scientific articles in that way, and they believed that that course highly was based on scientific research, with some deviation ( $m=5.0$ ,  $sd=1$ ). The satisfaction of seminars/workshops in the summative evaluation had the mean number of 5.5 and the sd of 0.7, and oral presentation the mean value of 4.8 and sd of 1.2. The Public Outreach Paper was also generally appreciated (mean value of written examination was 4.8, sd was 0.9, and the relevance of the examination for the learning outcomes had the mean value of 5.3 and sd of ). Two student however expressed in the summative course evaluation that there were too many Journal Clubs and too few lectures, and as stated before, some students had problems with the critical review forms in the beginning of the course. Otherwise from the summative course evaluation it can be seen that the majority of the student were quite satisfied with opportunity for student influence ( $m=5.2$   $sd=1.2$ ), that they were satisfied with feedback from the teacher ( $m=5.1$ ,  $sd=0.9$ ) and from other students ( $m=5.1$ ,  $sd$  0.8) during the course, and that they appreciated the course coordinator of the course as a teacher - a number of students wrote that in the comments sections of the summative evaluation.

What can be overlooked for the next time the course is given is the workload. In the summative evaluation students expressed that many studied less than 40 hours per week. 11 students said that they studied less than 31 hours and 10 more than 31 hours. Only 1 studied more than 40 hours. The mean value of if the workload had been reasonable to match the learning outcomes was 4.5 with the sd of 1.1, which could be improved. In the summative evaluation it was also seen that, to some degree the students thought that their knowledge and experience could be more utilized during the course ( $m=4.7$ ,  $sd=1.0$ )

**Action plan:** Changes to be made in the short and long term are stated here, as well as the timetable for when the actions will be implemented, as well as the person responsible for the implementation.

If identified problems are left without action, this must be justified.

Follow-up of proposed measures according to the previous course report(s), is presented here.

Problems with the critical review forms that have been detected could be addressed by possibly changing them to another one that fits the literature better. Maybe not use two different for qualitative and quantitative research, but instead one more general for research articles. If still used, more time (than was given on the introduction this time of the course) could be given to rigorously go through how to use them and what is expected from the students when filling them in. Even though the student did not mention it, the literature of the course could also be overlooked and possibly updated with a few more contemporary/new articles just to keep the course fully up to date with the ongoing research in the field. Finally, the course might benefit from another/an new way for really ambitious and high achieving students to be able to go even deeper in to the field and also express and utilize their knowledge, so that no one will feel understimulated during the course. How/if this should be done is however up to the new course coordinator.

**To be completed by the course administrator**

<b>Publication of course report:</b> where and when publication was completed
---

191209
--------

---