

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)

Course name		
Criminology: Criminal Careers and Life Course Perspectives		
Course code	Scope (credits)	Semester in which the course is completed
KA912E	7,5	Autumn 2025
Specify the freestanding course or contract education (if the course has been completed within a programme, specify the name of the programme)		
Criminology, Master's Programme		
Course coordinator		Number of registered students
Linn Persson		50

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

Formative course evaluation/Momentary study climate assessment form for course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it has been carried out

**COURSE REPORT – COMPREHENSIVE
DOCUMENTATION OF COURSE EVALUATION
The Faculty of Health and Society**

Ongoing oral discussions about the course and it's examinations during lectures and seminars.	
Number of students who have completed the formative course evaluation/momentary study climate assessment	Percentage response rate (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.)
Ongoing oral discussions during lectures and seminars; no formal count of participants was recorded.	Formative evaluation was conducted orally rather than by questionnaire.
Summative course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
questionnaire 2025-11-06 - 2025-11-14	
Number of students who have completed the summative course evaluation (please indicate both the number of registered and the number of active students on the course)	Response rate as a percentage (please indicate, without decimals, response rate both based on the number of registered students and the number of active students on the course)
20 of 50 registered students responded (active-student denominator not available in the survey report).	About 40% of registered/active students.

Feedback to students who have completed the course: describe how and when the feedback has been given
☐ 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) ☐ By email (otherwise than above), how: ☒ In Canvas, how: In a post ☐ Through a discussion in class, how: ☐ In other way, how: Other comments about the feedback:
The course evaluation results and comments were communicated to students through a post in Canvas after the course. The feedback highlighted the positive overall evaluation, while also identifying areas for development, particularly the reading load and examination format.

Feedback to new students on the upcoming course: describe how feedback will be implemented
The main findings from the HT25 course evaluation will be presented at the start of the next course by the new course coordinator. Students will be informed that the course has been revised in

response to the evaluation, including, for example, a review of the reading list, clearer alignment between learning outcomes and assessment, and updated lectures and examination tasks.

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' 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
--

The course included two examinations: one written digital examination (digitamen) and one oral group presentation. All students passed the oral examination, and a high proportion also passed the written examination, with many achieving high grades. The mean value for the question concerning achievement of the intended learning outcomes was 5.0/6. The course structure, in which students worked with the literature in seminars, and the combination of written and oral assessment appear to have supported learning. At the same time, several students described the literature as extensive or heavy, and the evaluation identified concerns about the extent to which the digital examination allowed students to demonstrate analytical and critical understanding.
--

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 overall evaluation was positive, particularly regarding learning and the study environment. Students rated their achievement of the intended learning outcomes highly (mean 5.0/6), and responsibility for their own learning was rated very highly (5.4/6). The course materials and it being research-based was also rated highly (both 5.0/6). Support from peers and teachers was rated at 5.4/6, and the safe conversational environment received the highest rating, 5.5/6. These results are consistent with the course design, which emphasised seminar-based discussion of the literature and active student participation.

The main areas for improvement concern workload, assessment and course organisation. Although the workload was rated reasonably positively overall (4.8/6), free text comments repeatedly described the weekly reading load as "heavy". Students also suggested that the reading list should be more focused and that key readings should be identified more clearly. The digital examination received the lowest mean rating among the main course-related questions (4.4/6), and several students felt that multiple-choice questions did not provide sufficient opportunity to demonstrate critical and analytical understanding. The timing of the written examination only two days before the group presentation was also identified as challenging.

The opportunity for student influence was rated 4.6/6 and the forms of learning activities 4.6/6, indicating generally positive evaluations in these areas. Two pre-recorded lectures were also perceived by some students as less effective than live lectures. The international aspects were perceived as present but could be strengthened.
--

Taken together, the evaluation indicates that the course achieved its core educational aims and provided a supportive and research-based learning environment, but that the course can be improved especially through a more selective reading list and stronger alignment between learning outcomes and assessment.

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.

1. Reading list – Before the next course run, the course coordinator will review the literature list (I know My has done this already). Key/core readings will be identified more clearly, while maintaining sufficient breadth and research-based coverage. Responsibility: course coordinator.
2. Examination format and alignment – The written examination will be reviewed in relation to the intended learning outcomes and the wording of the course syllabus. Particular attention will be given to whether the assessment provides sufficient opportunity for students to demonstrate discussion, critical analysis and application of course concepts. Responsibility: course coordinator.
3. Assessment scheduling – The timing of the written examination and group presentation should be reviewed. Where possible, the assessments will be spaced further apart to reduce the concentration of workload immediately before the end of the course. Responsibility: course coordinator.
4. Lectures and learning activities – The use of the two pre-recorded lectures should be reviewed. Where appropriate, live lectures or opportunities for synchronous discussion should be prioritized. Responsibility: course coordinator.
6. Presentation task – The oral group presentation should be reviewed to allow greater scope for students' own research and creative approaches, while retaining an appropriate connection to the course's theoretical framework. Responsibility: course coordinator.
7. International perspectives – The course already includes international aspects, but these could be made more explicit where feasible, for example through the selection of comparative research and examples from different national contexts. Responsibility: course coordinator.

Follow-up: The above changes should be implemented and reviewed during the next course run.

Publishing and archiving (arranged by course administrator)

Archiving and publication of the course report: where and when archiving and publication were completed
--

Valen

Course administrator

**COURSE REPORT – COMPREHENSIVE
DOCUMENTATION OF COURSE EVALUATION
The Faculty of Health and Society**

Name	Date
Åsa Nilsson	2025-11-24