

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
Åsa Nilsson	210629

Background information (to be completed by the course administrator)

Course name		
Criminological Theory		
Course code	Scope (credits)	Semester in which the course is completed
KA823E	15	Spring 2021
Specify a single subject course or contract education (if the course has been completed within a programme, specify the programme name)		
Criminology, Master's Programme (Two-Year)		
Course coordinator		Number of registered students
Mika Hagerlid		32

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

Formative course evaluation type of course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
Number of students who answered the formative course evaluation	Percentage response rate
Summative course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
Questionnaire, June 2021	
Number of students who responded to summative course evaluation	Percentage response rate

13

41%

Feedback to students: how (via email, canvas, dialogue in the classroom) and when the feedback was implemented

Some feedback have been given in dialogue on the final seminar of the course. The course report is uploaded to the canvas page of the course upon completion.

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

Results: 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

Means are presented below, scales ranges from 1-6:

Achieved learning outcomes (5.1)

Working/learning activities supported learning (4.6)

Examination was an opportunity to show how well you have achieved the learning outcomes (4.8)

The course met expectations (4.6)

Taking responsibility for learning (5.2)

Course materials made it easier to achieve learning outcomes (4.3)

Research based (5.5)

Resonable workload (3.3)

Student influence (4.1)

5 of the responding students spent 31-40 hours/week on the course, 5 spent more than 40 hours a week and 3 spent 21-30 hours.

International aspects had a mean of 2.5 on a scale from 1-3

The students generally rate the course higher in comparison to last year, and also spend much more time on their studies.

In the open answers, the course is described as both challenging and rewarding. One student writes that they were surprised by the high workload, an three other describe that it was hard to get through the weekly seminar literature. One writes that it might be better with smaller seminar groups, and one student would like to see more free discussions that are not examined and also suggest that it should be mandatory to participate on the presentations. It was also suggested that the peer-review be moved a week later. Several students writes that they appreciate that the course was well structured, and that they liked having an engaged teacher and that the lectures were good.

Two students writes about challenges associated with covid, one describes difficulties in having group work when everyone is in different times zones meaning that they needed to put in work on weekends and late evenings, the other describes missing their social context and to have contact with other students.

I've received oral feedback from students throughout the course, which were in line with the overall answers in the survey.

Some quotes:

"It was a combination of individual and team work. Everything was well explained and research based."

"Personally I am not pro group work, especially not during Covid. We are all in different phases in life and having a family where studies are marked from 8-17 and family time on weekends is hard to meet with younger students. I had to give up some weekends and evening to make this course work and that should not be the case since that adds extra stress and does not give a good "work-life" balance when you can't decide over your own time.

Otherwise, a great course that really pushes you to the limits and I really like that. I have learnt a lot and did enjoy the poster presentations that were more free discussions but of course learned a lot during the seminar discussions. Mika is an amazing teacher, I love the planning, there are no surprises in schedules etc and she is so well prepared and great in explaining and takes time to give a good explanation when we have difficult questions. For teacher effort, definitely the highest score"

"There was way too much to read. I had to skim read everything. Our teacher was very engaged, which I liked a lot!"

"I really enjoyed this course, and I think it has been great to have a seminar every week. However, I think the amount of literature for each week has been excessive, rather making it more difficult to grasp the purpose or topic than helping. When it's too much information at once it is difficult to sort it, and it has felt more like a race against the clock. I liked the fact that we had half class seminars since it was nice to get many different perspectives on the topic, although it was difficult to get a flow in discussions which would have enabled a deeper understanding as well as broad. Perhaps groups of five or something had been better for that. Generally a great course though, thank you so much and have a lovely summer!"

Analysis: 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.

Adding lectures and more structure to the course since last time seems to have paid off well, and it is good to continue with this. It might be beneficial to divide the seminar literature into key literature and additional literature, not making everything mandatory.

I don't believe it is possible to make presentations mandatory for all class, since we are not able to make anything mandatory that is not also graded. When grading, we need to set certain criteria for participation that the students need to live up to. Instead, I believe that it is important that there are spaces for discussion on the course that is not graded, especially since more such discussions were asked for.

It might also be possible to have a discussion group meeting regularly for those interested, I am going to look into the forms for that for next year, but it might also be a little much since many already spend a many hours on their studies for the course.

Having the peer-review seminars a week later is probably easier, since many had a high workload during the course weeks with seminars.

We generally hope to be able to have the course on campus next year, meaning that it will be easier with group work and social context.

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.

See comments above.

To be completed by the course administrator

Publication of course report: where and when publication was completed

210914 (Box)