

Course Report

the Department of Criminology (DoC), Malmö University (MAH)

Course reports form a vital part of our quality assurance work; development of courses and programs and to ensure students' rights to influence their education. The structure for MAHs course evaluation process is described in the document *Policy för kvalitetsbygge: kursutvärdering*. The course report contains background information/key numbers, a summary of the students' course evaluations, an analysis, plan of action and suggestions for further course development. The course report is published on the course website.

Background information

Course: Criminality and Ill-Health

Term/Semester: Spring 2018 (20181)

Ladok* Code: KA721E

Course coordinator: Marie Väfors Fritz

Number of registered students: 32 (31 students who were actively participating in the course)

Response rate: 25 Student answered the course eval. 78.13% according to the electronically made report in SUNET SURVEY (but more correctly 25/31 students = **80.65 %**)

Was the following conducted:	If yes: X
Communication of previous course evaluation at course start	X
Early dialog on expectations of the course	X
Half-term or Formative course evaluation	
Summary course evaluation	X
Feedback/Comments to students	X

Below are mean values described on a scale that reaches from 1 (to very little extent) to 6 (to a very high extent):

Learning outcomes reached (4.6); Work formats (4.3); Lectures, incl IT-based (4.3); Seminars (4.9); Forum with student discussion (JCs) (5.2); Written assignment (4.8); Practical exercises (4.8); Group work (4.3); Own studies (4.7); Oral presentations (3.9);

Course material (4.5); Its Learning (4.2); Other work material (4.4); Feedback from teacher (4.3) from students (4.1); Structure (4.6); Examination (4.7); Research based course (5.1); Students knowledge been utilized (4.3); Work load (5.0); Student influence (4.4).

These mean values together with the students' other thoughts (based on the Sunet Survey) written as open remarks at the end of the survey and IRL discussion after the students responses have been read by the teachers are included in this report.

In general the course got great reviews and great comments for future improvements. The teaching activities in the course were appreciated (the critical review forms, the journal clubs and writing a science outreach as well as the peer-review sessions) and the students wrote in the course evaluation that they learned a lot from these. Mostly students said that there was a fair amount of JCs but two students wanted at least one additional journal club to be added. Students also appreciated the critical review forms since this increased the level of preparedness in students.

The students expressed that the course was well planned, well structured (except for one students who experienced the opposite), fun, interesting and that they enjoyed it. This is great to hear since this has been developed since previous times the course has been taught.

One students noted that the Study Guide needs to be developed regarding, for instance, further instructions to the final paper. Two students expressed disappointment in the evaluation of active participation and one student wanted clearer descriptions on how the different assessments were weighted. One student addressed that the seminars ought to be obligatory since the JCs were. Finally, one student wanted a chance to revise the final paper after getting feedback on it. For next course the issues brought up in this last paragraph will be looked over to see if the students' requests can be met successfully.