

## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 4FF014	<b>Course title</b> Professional Development and Ethics	<b>Credits</b> 5
<b>Semester</b> HT-24	<b>Period</b> 20241211-20250119	

<b>Course coordinator</b> Gunnar Schulte	<b>Examiner</b> Gunnar Schulte
<b>Teacher in charge of component</b> Hanna Jansson, Lisa Smeds Alenius, Gert helgesson and Tomas Månsson	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Thomas Sakmar, Andreas Lundquist and Igor Adameyko

<b>Number of registered students during the three week check</b> 46	<b>Number approved on the last course date</b> 44	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 68,18%
--	--	---

### Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)

Due to the relatively short course length and the fact that it coincided with the holiday, a mid-course feedback session was not scheduled. However, a quick survey was conducted after the first campus session, which led to some adoptions of the coming sessions. After completion of the course, the programme invited student and teacher representatives to a course council.

### Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students

### 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: 20250306

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

The course was redesigned this year based on suggestions from last year's course survey. In summary, course themes were merged and developed to link leadership with communication and put more emphasis on sustainability. A blended learning pedagogical approach (consisting of preparatory readings, exercises, and interactive workshops) was adopted to increase flexibility while ensuring everyone was prepared to discuss and contribute to peer learning at the mandatory workshops. A new group assignment was developed and the assessment instructions were revised to better align with other courses in the programme.

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

According to the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation, most thought that the course developed valuable expertise/skills to "a very small" or to "small extent" (mean 2.1). At the same time, there were also students who answered "to a very large extent". When asked if they had achieved all intended learning outcomes, most answered "to some extent" (mean 2.9). Most question followed the same pattern with mean values on the quantitative questions varying from 2.0-2.8.

When asked to describe what had been particularly good during the course, students mentioned the overall subject as interesting, important and valuable for their future careers. The "career portraits" were appreciated. Lastly, the overall organisation was described as well-thought-out and structured.

When asked to describe how the course could be improved, it was clear that the students were disappointed and upset that the course had three mandatory days that the course management did not offer as hybrid sessions. The students experience this as inflexible and not empathic with students' personal situations. Some students mentioned that the self-studies were informative but overlapped too much with the workshops. It was suggested that the questions could be saved for the workshop day and incorporate more exercises related to scientific scenarios, such as how to handle workplace conflicts or a small ethical debate. This would make room for more practical examples and real-life applications, aligning the course better with the programme. A few students perceived that it was too much to read, and that the reading instruction was too specific (micro managed). The instructions on how many references to be included in the final reports were considered unclear, and the communication related to this was not enough. The late announcement of how long the oral presentations were supposed to be was also brought up as problematic and something that should be improved.

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

***Strengths of the course:*** The focus on transferable generic skills provides a foundation for the student's professional and personal development within academia and beyond. The course design, with a mix of theory (methods and tools) and practical application (for each course theme but also intertwined as part of the assignments), can drive the individual learning processes forward. Additionally, the course exposes students to a different perspective, complementary to their "scientific" training, broadening their understanding of essential skills needed for their future careers.

***Weaknesses of the course:*** The campus workshops must incorporate even more practical examples and real-life applications. The biggest challenge however, was the students' unfortunate expectations related to mandatory attendance.

#### **4. Other views**

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

**In conclusion, we will work on the weaknesses and the suggestions from students that were constructive. We will continue to build on what has worked well after the redesign and revise what is needed regarding course literature. More examples and applications will be added to the workshops. We will consider another type of examination of the individual assignment. Lastly, we will consider adding a course council before the holidays.**

**Appendices:**