



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 5MT006	Course title Frontiers in Translational Medicine	Credits 16.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT21	Dates 2021-10-19 - 2022-01-16	

Course Director Louisa Cheung, Fredrik Wermeling	Examiner Rachel Fisher
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course Alexander Espinosa, Bernhard Schmierer, Sylvain Peugot, Diego Velasques, Zhichao Zhou, Azad Saei, Mattias Westerlund, Helga Westerlind, Helena Idborg Ian Torao Hoffecker	Other participating teachers Elena Rodriguez-Vieitez, Maria Sabater, Maja Jagodic, Lisa Villabona, Cecilia Österholm, Weng-Onn Lui, Hong Jin, Valentina Carannante, Isabella Magalhaes, Vitaly Kaminsky, Martin Eklund, Joakim Dahlin, Qiaolin Deng, Camila Consiglio Cheng Zhang, Laetitia Lemonine, Mingmei Shang, Claudia Kutter

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 28	Number passed at final course day 26	Response frequency course valuation survey 75% (21 out of 28)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) Course council, three times		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students Email with link to the survey report, published on Canvas and course web page		

Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also to the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 2021-04-26
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2021-04-26

1. Description of any changes implemented since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students

One of the main feedbacks from former students was to expand the course leadership, therefore some personnel changes were made: A co-course director (Fredrik Wermeling) and a dedicated teacher for the project work (Alexandra Espinosa) were appointed.

To make the assessment of project work fairer, project work mentors were involved in assessment starting this year.

Other main personnel changes were new journal club leaders (Mattias Westerlund, Helga Westerlind and Helena Idborg) and new biostatistics instructor (Ian Torao Hoffecker).

With some of the COVIC restrictions lifted during the course, study visits to some SciLifeLab core facilities resumed this year.

2. Brief summary of the students' evaluation of the course

(Based on the students' quantitative responses to the course valuation and key views from free text responses. Quantitative summary and any graphs are attached.)

Students were generally satisfied with the course with criticism on the communication, Canvas course page design and confusions around the project work.

	Mean (SD)	Median
What is your overall opinion of the course?	3.6 (1.1)	4
The highest two from the five general questions		
In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	3.7 (0.9)	4
In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	3.7 (1.0)	4
The highest two from the programme-specific questions		
I took responsibility for my own learning during this course.	4.2 (0.8)	4
To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded?	3.6 (1.2)	4
The lowest from the five general questions		
In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	2.9 (1.2)	3
The lowest from the programme-specific questions		
The feedback that I have received has been important for my development and learning.	3.1 (1.3)	3

3. The Course Director's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

Strengths of the course:

Similar to students' feedback from previous years, the main strengths are

- Broad scope of current research topics, hence possibility to meet many active researchers
- Project work as a mini research project with budgeting and clear roles in teamwork

Weaknesses of the course:

Communication, Canvas course page design and information around the project work were not satisfactory.

From the evaluation survey, the common theme (i.e. applying molecular techniques to study human diseases) were not communicated clearly. The feedback to the students was one of the main weakness again this year. More focus will be put to improve feedback in the next course occasion.



3. Other views

Although the restrictions from the pandemic and the general situation were better than HT20, the society and daily logistics were still heavily affected by the pandemic. There were also more cases of sickness and hospitalization both in the instructors and students, which undeniably affected the teaching quality and the learning experience.

4. Course Director's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)

In summary, students were overall satisfied with the course, despite major criticism on communication and way of information flow. The course directors took part in the working group to discuss and deal with these issues. There will be extra effort in coordinating with other courses in order to standardize the presentation of information (schedule, deadlines and course web page design) and the communication channels. Clearer expectations will also be exchanged between students and teachers, with regularly follow-up during the course.

The course will be revised (cut-down in length and scope) due to changes in the programme curriculum. With the support of and consultation with the programme committee, the course leadership will re-design the course in terms of content and form.

	Areas of improvement / Activities	Responsible	Time plan
1	Communicating expectations from and to students	LC, FW	HT22
2	Optimize the assessment rubrics for project work	LC, AE	HT22
3	Improvement of feedback (Speed, content)	Involved teachers	HT22
4	Re-design the course for the revised programme curriculum	LC, FW	HT22-VT23
5	Changes in the syllabus (intended learning outcomes) on intercultural communication, sustainability development goals (SDGs) and diversity and equality	LC, FW	VT23

Appendices: