

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF014	Course title Professional Development and Ethics	Credits 5
Semester HT-23	Period	
Course coordinator Gunnar Schulte		Examiner Gunnar Schulte
Teacher in charge of component NA		Other participating teachers Hanna Jansson, Mia von Knorring, Gert Helgesson, Ulrik Kihlbom, Tomas Månsson, Anna Birgersdotter
Number of registered students during the three week check 35	Number approved on the last course date 32	Response frequency course valuation survey 48.65%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)		
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: 20240522

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

The course was organised for the second time. Based on the feedback from last year, the instructions were revised for both group and individual assignments. Compared to last year, the course was consolidated with sessions scheduled in one block, not overlapping with another course (except for the self-study period over Christmas). The practical workshops counted as mandatory since more mandatory sessions were requested last year. Another guest lecturer was also invited.

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 only to "a very small" or to "small extent" developed valuable expertise/skills (mean 2.2). When asked if they had achieved all intended learning outcomes, most answered that this

was the case “to a small” or “some extent” (mean 2.5). The answers to the question about a common theme running throughout the course were more evenly distributed from “to a very small” to “a very large extent” (mean 2.7). Most students thought that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking to “a small extent” (mean 2.1). The structure and methods used were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes to “a small” or “some extent” according to most students (mean 2.4). The answers to the question about the possibility of relating to previous knowledge were a bit more distributed from “to a very small” to “a large extent” (mean 2.2). Most students thought they received feedback of important for personal development and learning to “a small extent” (2.2). The communication with teachers was more evenly distributed (answers on all levels) (mean 2.9). According to most students, the teachers had only been open to ideas and opinions to “a small” extent (mean 2.3).

When asked to describe what had been particularly good during the course, the overall structure with different modules/themes was mentioned. Communication, leadership, the ethics workshop, and the guest lecturers were mentioned specifically. One student also mentioned the direct feedback on final presentations.

When asked to describe how the course could be improved, it was clear that the students were disappointed that the course still had full days scheduled. It was also clear that more practical examples are needed, especially regarding ethical dilemmas. Students did not appreciate the learning activities utilizing play-based learning. Still, they asked for more application and problem-solving. The pace of the teaching was brought up, and there is room to go into more depth. Many students mentioned challenges with the assignments and that the instructions were still unclear. Some students mentioned that they did not like Prof Frizzled’s case. One student brought up the grading and that it did not reflect the exercise given. Another student mentioned the fact that some project groups had to submit a minor revision to pass the assignment and argued that this shows that there is something wrong with the grading.

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), drives the individual learning processes forward.

***Weaknesses of the course:* The course was scheduled in four blocks representing each theme. Each theme consisted of one full day of introduction and presentation of theory and models followed by a half-day practical application in a mandatory workshop. After running the course two times, it is clear that this format has to be changed. The students experience the days too long. And even if one-third of the course is already workshop-based, aiming to apply theoretical models, this is not enough (or not successfully delivered). The nature of the topics taught and, with this, the design of assignments made the instructions too vague even after major revisions.**



4. Other views

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

In conclusion, after running the course twice with slight adjustments but based on the same design, it is now clear that it has to be redesigned. The course has to be aligned with the programme's overall structure and match students' expectations to increase the conditions for the learning objectives to be reached. This work will be led by the course organising team but conducted in collaboration with the programme director and student representatives.

Appendices: