

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4BI114	Course title Frontiers in Biomedicine: Research Project 1	Credits 15hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT-22	Period March 23 - June 5, 2022	

Course coordinator Bernhard Lohkamp	Examiner Bernhard Lohkamp
Teacher in charge of component	Other participating teachers various

Number of registered students during the three week check 43	Number approved on the last course date 42	Response frequency course valuation survey 72.1%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) N/A		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Survey (without comments) published on Canvas course page (and on open Kursweb Drupal). Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey. Meet with course representative to discuss survey and analysis.		

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

This is the first instance of this particular course, so no direct student influence on this course could be implemented.

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 course appears to be appreciated by the students as it provides an opportunity to do research, learn new methods, get to know research groups etc. This is especially important in sight of the degree project as well as potential PhD studies. Students developed new skills and trained scientific thinking and reasoning. Communication and information flow from the course director to students and supervisors was not optimal and at times late. Furthermore, the examination session proves challenging in concept to students and examining teachers alike and requires more clarifications.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course allows the students to learn a new method in the context of a short research project. This is an excellent opportunity to learn (new) methods, get acquainted with research in general and research groups at KI in particular. Very relevant assessment using discussion session. Project meetings give students opportunities to discuss, meet, reflect on their project and progress.

Weaknesses of the course:

Timing and number of assessments can be improved. Some assessments may have been given too short time for completion. Other assessment felt superfluous and/or require more instructions to make them meaningful. Certainly, the communication and esp. information flow was not optimal. Some information was delayed due to technical issues and/or an attempt to streamline instructions between the project courses.

3. Other views

The examination sessions were grouped roughly by research area when possible, but it appeared that this was occasionally taken too literally.

It was suggested that some assessment criteria could/should be adjusted to evaluate rather progress than potentially existing expertise.

Due to some administrative error rooms were not booked for the entirety of the examination session.

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.)

General information for the course is at large available now so there should not be any delay in providing this information the next time the course is given. Updates will expected to be available on time.

Communication with the supervisors will hopefully not be hampered by technical issues any more (BLo and IT-support).

Already during the course the reflections on the progress meetings and their comments have been discussed with the pedagogical developer Cormac McGrath with the conclusion that the comments to the reflections will be removed (it was not possible to change during the course due to the syllabus). The 2nd progress meeting will be re-evaluated and potentially spaced out more (albeit it may be difficult to schedule due to various holidays during the course). Additionally, the content of the 2nd meeting will be revised with view on progression (BLo & C. McGrath).

The allowed word count of project summary will be increased marginally to allow extra words for figure legends.

The assessment criteria will be reviewed to allow as much as possible fairer assessment for all students irrespective of prior knowledge and skills (BLo & C. McGrath).

Several aspects of the course will be clarified to the students, e.g. student selection for the examination groups, shorter deadlines for some assessments etc. (BLo).

Even though supervisors and examiners have been clearly informed of their duties it appears they not always adhere to it. The course director will ensure that examining teachers are (better) aware of scope of the course, the format of the assessment as well as assessment criteria (BLo). Similarly, supervisors will be reminded about their role e.g. in assessment etc. (BLo). Smaller examination groups will be considered to allow students more time for discussion.

Note: the examination session in form of a round-the-table discussion should not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination and hence different to other used ones and a very real situation. Sadly, this is very often misunderstood by the students (and even some examining teachers). New ways (vocabulary, descriptions) need to be found to clarify this for all involved since the current form despite all efforts does work satisfactory.

Appendices:

Survey