

## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 1BI039	<b>Course title</b> Chemical Biology	<b>Credits</b> 8hp
<b>Semester</b> (spring/autumn) VT-22	<b>Period</b> April 29 – June 5, 2022	

<b>Course coordinator</b> Bernhard Lohkamp	<b>Examiner</b> Bernhard Lohkamp
<b>Teacher in charge of component</b>	<b>Other participating teachers</b> various

<b>Number of registered students during the three week check</b> 47	<b>Number approved on the last course date</b> 35	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 61.7%
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course committee meetings (1 during the course), one after to discuss the survey and course analysis.		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students</b> Survey (without comments) published on course Canvas page and will be published on the kursweb page (Drupal). Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey. Will discuss survey with the course committee.		

### Note that...

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

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: **08/09/22**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 08/09/22

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

The lab manuals for both the computer and inhibitor (wet) lab have been further revised to clarify several points incl. the separation of information text from questions. Several general points have been further emphasised e.g. the overall view of the course, that chemistry will be important, preparation for the workshop is important. The compulsory online pre-lab quiz for the wet lab was extended. The Labster simulation (for NMR) was retained. Students will be given the presentation order for the project work the day before. Students were given brief feedback on their presentation.

### 2. Brief summary of the students' valuations 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.)*

The students are overall satisfied with the course from learning new, interesting information to the corresponding examination. Some feel thought that the exam was too comprehensive and the computer lab too difficult. However, the underlying thread in the course which holds the different parts together is present now. The computer lab was generally perceived as interesting and fun. The group, project work was overall well received. Students were positive to it, learned a lot, appreciated the compulsory meetings, random presentation approach, group members/dynamics. The lab manuals appear still to require some

more clarification. Furthermore, the wet lab overall is challenging for the students (both in terms of performance as well as analysis), so lab lecture and or analysis session are thought after. Students would appreciate more reading instructions/source since there is no text book available as such.

### 3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

#### *Strengths of the course:*

Teaching staff, topic, and content as such is very much appreciated by the students. The computer lab incl. introduction of Chimera appears well liked and teaches the students a lot. The project work focused in the end of the course allows students to apply the gained knowledge in their own work. Seminars are a good way of learning for the students. Different ways of assessing students skills.

#### *Weaknesses of the course:*

The lack of a (one!) suitable text book partially due to "different" topics make it difficult for students to know and find relevant information. Overall, it appears that the course is very lecture and theory based with little student active teaching and applications. Some instructions need clarification and/or be extended e.g. for the lab compendia. Computer lab was challenging for some students who fell behind due to this (although participation in associated teaching sessions as well as esp. offered online help was very poor in the beginning). The exam was experienced by some as too extensive (however results were comparable to previous years).

### 3. Other views

Students continue to have difficulty in the analysis of data using e.g. excel and doing simpler lab related calculations. This will be addressed in the programme to be included in several courses.

It is debatable if lab manuals are confusing and/or are not clear and in which format they should be written. Having simple lists to follow is (in my opinion) not allowing students to further their practical knowledge and skills on a higher level. However, there may have to be a slower progression than currently applied.

### 4. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

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

The lab compendia will be revised further in different ways. Some experimental parts of the wet lab are probably too complex and specialised anyway, so should be replaced with different experiments. This may indirectly clarify the manual already (BLo, HAx). The online pre-lab quizzes will be extended further to ensure more complete preparation of the students which will result in a smoother lab operation and higher learning experience (BLo). The corresponding lecture will be extended to allow more reference to the lab (BLo, ASJ). The computer lab manual will be considered to be restructured to increase the flow. Possible text books will be evaluated again to see if the course content can be more defined (BLo, P. Arvidsson, M. Haraldsson). However, there is usually the problem that text books will either focus on Chemical Biology or Drug Discovery but not both, a new edition of a published text book may actually change this but is still not published yet. Replacing some lecture with a seminar or lecture AND seminar will be considered esp. for longer lectures (in structural biology). Alternatively, some topics could be approached by TBL (BLo). It will be considered to remove all bonus points since individual assessment for the lab (reports) is problematic even though one report is written individually. Instead, additional requirements for VG should be introduced, e.g. certain grade for lab report, project work assessment (BLo). Fewer and later mandatory project work meetings will be considered (BLo).

### Appendices:

Survey