

The work with course evaluations and course reports constitutes a part of the faculty's quality assurance work in education at first-cycle and second-cycle education. The course report is a comprehensive documentation of the course evaluation and is an important instrument for the development of courses and programmes as well as for guaranteeing the students' influence on these. The course report takes into account the students' course evaluations, the teachers' views on the course's implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' achieved learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes of the course. Key figures, an analysis and a development plan for the course are also included in the course report.

It is of the utmost importance that students are given the opportunity to participate throughout the course evaluation process and that they make use of the opportunity to give constructive criticism. In this way, the results can serve as a relevant and specific foundation for improvement.

The structure for course evaluation is described in the "Course evaluation process for first- cycle and second-cycle education at Malmö University" (in Swedish *Kursvärderingsprocessen för utbildning på grundnivå och avancerad nivå vid Malmö universitet*), Ref. no. LED 1.3-2018/123) and in the "Routines for course evaluations and course reports at the Faculty of Health and Society" (in Swedish *Rutiner för kursvärderingar och kursrapporter vid Fakulteten för hälsa och samhälle*), Ref. no. LED 1.3-2016/187.

The course report compiled after each completed (full) course forms the basis for feedback to students and is followed up at quality dialogues at faculty- and university-wide level.

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

<b>Course name</b>		
Criminological Theory		
<b>Course code</b>	<b>Scope (credits)</b>	<b>Semester in which the course is completed</b>
KA823E	15	Spring 2024
<b>Specify the freestanding course or contract education (if the course has been completed within a programme, specify the name of the programme)</b>		
Master's Programme in Criminology + Freestanding course		
<b>Course coordinator</b>		<b>Number of registered students</b>
Alexander Engström		42

**Students' perspective** (to be completed, if possible, by the course administrator or in some cases by the course coordinator)

<b>Formative course evaluation/Momentary study climate assessment</b> form for course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it has been carried out	
We had an informal oral check mid-course to see whether the students had any thoughts or wishes regarding the course. No particular issues were raised.	
<b>Number of students who have completed the formative course evaluation/momentary study climate assessment</b>	<b>Percentage response rate</b> (the response rate should be indicated as a percentage when the formative course evaluation has been carried out via questionnaire, for example when conducting a momentary study climate assessment.)

<b>Summative course evaluation</b> (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
Questionnaire 2024-03-21 - 2024-03-29	
<b>Number of students who have completed the summative course evaluation</b> (please indicate both the number of registered and the number of active students on the course)	<b>Response rate as a percentage</b> (please indicate, without decimals, response rate both based on the number of registered students and the number of active students on the course)
18	43

<b>Feedback to students who have completed the course: describe how and when the feedback has been given</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> By email (will be send automatically, with or without the course coordinator's comments, by the survey system 7 days after the survey is closed) <input type="checkbox"/> By email (otherwise than above), how: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Canvas, how: <b>Published on the course page</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Through a discussion in class, how: <input type="checkbox"/> In other way, how:  Other comments about the feedback:

<b>Feedback to new students on the upcoming course: describe how feedback will be implemented</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presented at the start of the course, how: <b>Presented at the course introduction</b> <input type="checkbox"/> In other way, how:

**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' achieved learning outcomes in relation to the course intended learning outcomes are summarised here (incl. information regarding the result of the examination). Both success factors and problems are identified</p>
<p>Most students reached a passing grade on the individual essay which indicates that the learning outcomes were met.</p> <p>A success factor is the fact that the essay is based on the learning outcomes. This means that a student who follows the essay template will not miss any important part of the contents that are examined in the course. This semester, all course activities were explicitly aligned with the essay which seems to have been useful in helping the students achieve the learning outcomes. The course structure was redesigned this semester which helped the students focus more on the essay and the course was less burdensome than previous years. It should also be mentioned that the students were</p>

generally better at ontological/epistemological aspects and level of explanation which are two themes that were more in focus in this semester.

Although minor, a problem for the examination was the fact that some students did not follow the essay instructions. The instructions are quite clear but might need to be explained further to the students. Another problem was that many students did not attend the peer-review seminar which could have helped many students to improve their essays.

**Analysis:** Analysis based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations – both formative (if any), and summative evaluations. Produced in collaboration with the teachers involved in the course, alternatively by taking their views into account.

The course evaluation only reflects a few students' thoughts about the course so it must be interpreted with caution. Here are the key mean numbers from the survey (each question rated from 1 to 6):

1. Achieved the course's intended learning outcomes = 4.1
2. Support from learning activities to reach the learning outcomes = 3.7
3. The examination gave the opportunity to show achievement of learning outcomes = 4.2
4. Course expectations met reality = 3.9
5. Take responsibility for own learning = 5.6
6. Help from course materials to achieve learning outcomes = 4.3
7. Research based course = 5.3
8. Reasonable workload = 4.5
9. Student influence = 4.1
10. Support from peers = 4.7
11. Support from teachers = 4.7
12. Clear information about learning outcomes = 4.4
13. Safe conversational environment = 5.2

Time spent per week: under 10 hrs = 11 %, 11-20 hrs = 28 %, 21-30 hrs = 11 %, 31-40 hrs = 33 % and over 40 hrs = 17 %.

International aspects: mean = 2 (rated 1-3)

Main points from open answers:

Positive

- Good lectures/teachers
- Challenging but good examination
- Good structure/organization
- Good communication

Negative/parts that can be developed

- Bad lectures/teachers
- Should have more lectures
- Too much mainstream criminology, too little focus on critical theories
- Difficult to write the essay (e.g too few words, difficult format, etc.)
- Too similar to the first course in the masters program
- Less presentation and more discussion at the seminars

- Too focused on US perspectives

#### Analysis

The survey responses indicate that the responding students are fairly content with the course although there is a lot of variation among the students. A lot of changes were made this semester and it is therefore important that the students were happy with the new structure. The workload was less heavy this semester which is also reflected in the question pertaining to this aspect. However, quite a lot of the responding students state that they do not spend enough time on the course (39 % state that they spent 20 hrs or less). Although the lowered workload was an important change, it might have been a bit too low for some students.

Another issue worth discussing is the contents of the course. This course does not aim to describe a lot of different theories, it aims to take a meta-theoretical perspective by discussing theories from different angles (e.g. ontology and epistemology, level of explanation, practical applications). This can be better explained to the students in upcoming semesters. To illustrate the topics covered in the course, the teachers usually use their own examples which are of course aligned with each teachers perspectives. This means that that when it comes to empirical examples etc., the course is biased towards the teachers' expertise which in turn reflects the department's research profile. Still, students have selected theories by themselves and it has been possible to write about e.g. critical theories and other perspectives that the students are interested in. However, this can be better explained by the teachers.

Regarding the seminars, the teachers agree with the students who suggest that the presentations can be shorter to spend more time on the discussions.

No students commented on the course literature but the teachers suggest that one book and one article is removed and that more literature can be selected freely by having more additional literature.

**Course development and action plan:** Course coordinator's suggestions for changes, comments and actions. Describe the relevant and possible changes to be implemented in the short and long term and when they are planned to be put into action. Specify who is responsible for the implementation: the course coordinator or another teacher. If a problem was identified, explain why nonetheless no consequent changes are warranted. Follow-up of measures proposed based on previous course report(s) should also be presented here.

#### Suggested short term changes (course coordinator)

- Better explain the course structure and the course contents. This includes the role of the teachers (they will use their expertise to provide examples) and the course's aim to not describe a lot of theories but to focus on different aspects of relevance for any theory (e.g. ontological/epistemological perspectives)
- Shorten the presentation time at the seminar to save more time for discussions.
- Update the literature list: remove Downes et al. and McAra & McVie. Increase the number of additional pages selected by the course teachers. Additional literature can both be articles and book chapters (freely available online for the students). See the reading lists on Canvas. It should also be clearly stated that the students select their own literature in relation to their selected topics for the essay.

Suggested long term changes (course coordinator + program coordinator)  
- Revise the syllabus so that it better explains the unique contents of this course compared to the program's first theory course.

**Publishing and archiving (arranged by course administrator)**

<b>Archiving and publication of the course report:</b> where and when archiving and publication were completed
--

Valen
-------

**Course administrator**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
Åsa Nilsson	2024-04-09