

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: Contemporary Criminology		
Course code	Scope (credits)	Semester in which the course is completed
KA922E	7,5	Spring 2026
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
Dusan Stankovic		43

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	
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.)
12	28

Summative course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	
questionnaire 2026-04-30 - 2026-05-08	
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)
12	28

Feedback to students who have completed the course: describe how and when the feedback has been given
<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: uploaded and made an announcement <input type="checkbox"/> Through a discussion in class, how: <input type="checkbox"/> In other way, how: Other comments about the feedback:

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

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

<p>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</p>
<p>The students had overallly achieved passing grades in their essays and presentation assignments, which indicates that learning outcomes have been achieved. As required, all the students submitted essays in groups of two to three, beforehand presented in groups five to six (first seminar), and two to three (second and third seminars).</p> <p>Bellow is the list of ratings given by students who evaluated the course. Response rate is fairly low (12%), which is similar to the last year. Although self-evaluation scores are higher than the last year, this is not response rate that can ensure liability of the results.</p> <p>learning outcomes: 4.8 out of 6</p>

activities 4.3
 examination 4.9 og 6
 expectations 4.1
 own learning 5.8
 work materials 4.6
 research absed 5.2
 workload 5.2
 student influence 4.8
 peer support 5.8
 teacher supprt 5.8

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.

Students seem to have appreciated the support they got both from their peers and teachers (at the same level). They also rated the conversational environment as high, and information and instructions.

In the open-ended questions, they criticised the structure a bit. Firstly, they criticised the workload - three presentations and an essay were done in a short period of the course. Teachers agree with this and perhaps the half-way seminar could be dropped next year. Instead of it, hours could be used for a lecture or teacher-led seminar. This is also what the students called for in the evaluation. Some think that presentations could have been delivered differently, since they were all at the same time, and that they could have used that time more efficiently. This should be paid attention to by the next year's coordinator as I (Dusan, course coordinator) omitted to make such a distinction in the schedule.

They also expected more lectures and discussions around practical or applied criminology within contemporary criminology, which is related to discussed-above. Students overallly recommend this over the self-taught activities during the whole course.

Regarding the programme of master studies in Criminology as a whole, students also recommend less group work and more freedom in choosing with whom to work, as was the case in this course. In the current course, big groups were assigned by course coordinator, but students could swap. Then, small groups could also be switched so that students work on issues they are interested in or with people who they want to work with.

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.

The course has kept the same structure as it was from the previous year, which has been changed compared to previous ones and which was deemed as an improvement by the students and teacher (see course evaluation in 2025 and earlier). However, the structure can always be further improved. As mentioned, students criticised the workload of having three presentations in the short time without gaining benefits out of all. I agree

with this and recommend that the half-way (second) seminar could be dropped. Instead of it, hours could be used for a lecture or teacher-led seminar. If it would be seminar with a task, teachers should think of sit-in tasks for the students, for ex. based on the themes or readings in the course literature. This is because there is a concern of extended AI usage in the other course assignments (to create posters, to write the essays). However, AI misuse cannot always be confirmed. Therefore, suggestions from both teachers is that final (examination) seminar, when students present what they are going to write in the essays, be counted towards the final grade (50% of the grade for the poster presentation, 50% for the essay).

Also, as mentioned, next year's coordinator should paid greater attention to the schedule of seminars and perhaps, divide all of them into two blocks, so that students attend only one. Only first seminar would be beneficial to attend as a whole (since every presentation is on a different chapter of a book on Thematic Analysis).

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

Name	Date
Åsa Nilsson	2026-05-18