

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF014	Course title Professional development and ethics	Credits 5
Semester 1	Period 10 December to 16 January	

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

Number of registered students during the three week check 32	Number approved on the last course date 15	Response frequency course valuation survey 50%
--	--	--

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. 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 At the course council on 12th February

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: 260410

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

More examples and practical applications were integrated into the workshops. Assignment instructions were clarified and revised, and clearer guidance was provided regarding required and optional readings. Optional coaching sessions were scheduled digitally in advance to increase accessibility and structure.

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

According to the quantitative results, the course evaluation were highly polarised. For most questions, approximately half of the respondents gave high ratings, while a substantial proportion gave low ratings.

Several aspects received clearly positive evaluations. A large majority agreed that the course encouraged responsibility for one's own learning (median 6). Most students also reported feeling included and respected (median 5.5), and the teacher was generally perceived as explaining concepts clearly (median 5). The teaching was considered to be informed by research (median 5). Active learning elements and overall organisation showed a polarised pattern, but a majority still rated these positively (medians 5 and 4 respectively). At the same time, the overall rating and several alignment-related items were more divided (median 4), indicating substantial variation in student experience.

In the qualitative comments, the feedback was predominantly critical. Recurring themes included perceptions of too many concepts introduced within a short timeframe, insufficient guided application of tools and frameworks, and difficulties in understanding how different course components were connected. A substantial number of comments concerned lack of clarity regarding expectations and grading, particularly in relation to the individual assignment. Additional concerns were raised about the course running over the winter break and about the perceived relevance of the course to the overall programme.

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 main challenge concerned clarity and alignment, particularly regarding expectations and grading. Students experienced difficulties understanding how the different course components were connected and how they were expected to apply to the literature and tools in the examination.

4. Other views

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

The number of respondents was limited and the survey was therefore kept open for an extended period. As this remained open after the publication of final grade, this timing may have influenced some of the responses. It may also be noted that discussions during the course council reflected a more varied and, in several respects, more positive perspective, which corresponds to the substantial proportion of positive ratings in the quantitative results.

Appendices: