

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4NT001	Course title Molecular and genetic mechanisms in nutrition science	Credits 10
Semester Autumn -22	Period Second period (12 Oct-25 Nov)	
Course coordinator Christian Riedel		Examiner Magdalena Rosell
Teacher in charge of component Christian Riedel		Other participating teachers Anja Vikingson, Jonas Pettersson, Maria Henström, Eric Poortvliet, Johanna Zilliacus, Leonidas Lundell, Eckardt Treuter, Rongrong Fan, Federico Pietrocola, Paul Petrus, Martin Bergö, Scott Frendo-Cumbo, Federica Laguzzi, and others
Number of registered students during the three week check 33	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey 79 %
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course council with three student representatives in the middle of the course as well as a discussion with the whole class at the end of the course.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students The students were informed via an announcement in Canvas on 13 Dec.		

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

This is the first time this course is given. Some parts are the same or similar to the course on the one-year programme and some parts were changed. There were much more lectures, more journal clubs, and a new methods club. Workshop reports were no longer reviewed by the teacher alone but primarily peer-reviewed by the other students and then only cross-checked by the teacher.

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

Overall, the students were very happy with the course. In the course evaluation, the overall opinion of the course was mostly good (42%) or very good (34%). These ratings are substantially higher than for the previous course, which is nice to see. However, there still remain things to improve about the course. In general, the questions in the course evaluation were rated highly. However, the work load was viewed quite substantial in relation to the course's credits. Most students had put 45-55 hours per week for the course, and some even more. Also the methods club was viewed as too challenging and students wished to take it earlier in the course and see these methods in real life, e.g. during lab visits.

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

Strengths of the course: The course in general worked well regarding the content and structure. A broad spectrum of molecular and genetic mechanisms relevant to nutrition science were covered. The students found these lectures and workshops very stimulating. Also some of the other teaching forms in the course were much appreciated, particularly the journal clubs.

Weaknesses of the course: A big challenge for the course was the fact that the students have different backgrounds and thus different prior knowledge about molecular and genetic mechanisms in nutrition science. For some students, the contents of the course were easy to comprehend or even a repetition, while for others the contents were very novel and challenging. Partially as a consequence, the workload of the course was rather high for some students. Further, the methods club was too demanding. Prior background knowledge regarding methods was much lower than expected.

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

Based on the comments, we have several ideas how to improve the course for next year. We will reduce the number of workshop reports, to reduce the workload. We will schedule the methods club earlier in the course, so that the students learn about the methods before they see uses of them in workshops or journal clubs. For each student group that presents a method, we will try to arrange lab visits, so they can see this specific method in real life and may also document it by a short movie using their cell-phone. This will help their presentation of the method and make it hopefully more accessible to the other students.

We will further update the instructions for peer-review to improve its quality. And finally, we may introduce a written exam as a complement to the current examination forms.