

## Kursanalys (kursutvärdering)

<b>Kurskod</b> 4FF001	<b>Kurstitel</b> Professional Development and Ethics	<b>Högskolepoäng</b> 5
<b>Termin (vt/ht-år)</b> ht-22	<b>Tidsperiod</b> 21 november 2022 – 13 januari 2023	

<b>Kursansvarig</b> Gunnar Schulte	<b>Examinator</b> Gunnar Schulte
<b>Momentansvariga lärare</b> n/a	<b>Övriga medverkande lärare</b> Hanna Jansson, Mia von Knorring, Gert Helgesson, Ulrik Kihlbom, Anna Birgersdotter

<b>Antal registrerade studenter vid treveckorskontrollen</b> 37	<b>Antal godkända vid sista kursdatum</b> 21	<b>Svarsfrekvens kursvärderingsenkät</b> 54%
<b>Övriga metoder för studentinflytande (utöver avslutande kursvärdering)</b>		
<b>Återkoppling av kursvärderingsresultat till studenterna</b>		

### Observera att...

Analysen ska (tillsammans med sammanfattande kvantitativ sammanställning av studenternas kursvärdering) delges utbildningsnämnd vid kursgivande institution samt för programkurser även programansvarig nämnd.

Analysen har delgivits utbildningsnämnd följande datum:

Analysen har delgivits programansvarig nämnd följande datum:

### 1. Beskrivning av eventuellt genomförda förändringar sedan föregående kurstillfälle baserat på tidigare studenters synpunkter

Not applicable. The course was taught for the first time.

### 2. Kortfattad sammanfattning av studenternas värderingar av kursen

*(Baserad på studenternas kvantitativa svar på kursvärderingen och centrala synpunkter ur fritextsvar. Kvantitativ sammanställning och ev. grafer bifogas.)*

According to the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation, most thought that the course only to “a small “or to “some extent” developed valuable expertise/skills (mean 2.6). However, when asked if they had achieved all intended learning outcomes, most answered that this was the case “to some” or a “large extent” (mean 3.3). The answers to the question about a common theme running

throughout the course the answers were evenly distributed from “to a very small” to “a large extent“ (mean 3.0). Most students thought that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking to “some extent”, but except for that, the answers were again equally distributed among the other options (mean 3.0). The structure and methods used were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes to “a small” or “some extent” according to most students (mean 3.0). The answers to the question about the possibility of relating to previous knowledge were evenly distributed from “to a very small” to “a large extent“ (mean 2.8). The same goes for the question about feedback received, if it was important for personal development, but the mean was slightly higher (3.1). The communication with teachers worked well (to some, large or very large extent) according to all but one (mean 4.2). And according to most students, the teachers had been open to ideas and opinions to “a large” or “very large” extent (mean 3.9).

When asked to describe what had been particularly good during the course, several students mentioned the group assignment that helped to “put the learnings in a more realistic and scientific context”. The structure of having a lecture followed by a practical exercise was mentioned as a good idea. Several students also mentioned that it was nice that the course made them look at the scientific career from a different angle. The teachers (with expertise and background) and guest lecturers were also mentioned by several students.

When asked to describe how the course could be improved, many students mentioned that the assignment instructions were unclear. Several students also thought the lectures should be shortened, because they were not inspiring enough, less informative, or more time was needed for the assignments. The scheduling of the course in two blocks (overlapping another course) was brought up as a problem by many students. Several students also mentioned that the lectures were not mandatory and suggested that this should be changed to “facilitate more discussion and motivate students to attend”. Some students wanted more in-depth learning instead of “theoretical aspects” in general.

### **3. Kursansvarigs reflektioner kring kursens genomförande och resultat**

***Kursens styrkor:*** 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.

***Kursens svagheter:*** The course was scheduled in two separate blocks with several weeks (and another course) in between. No lectures or practical exercises were mandatory, only the course introduction (except for the oral presentation as part of the examination). The nature of the topics taught and with this, the design of assignments made the instructions too vague.

### **3. Övriga synpunkter**

#### 4. Kursansvarigs slutsatser och eventuella förslag till förändringar

(Om förändringar föreslås, ange vem som är ansvarig för att genomföra dessa och en tidsplan. )

- The assignment instructions will be reviewed and revised. *Hanna Jansson*
- More sessions will be mandatory, at least the practical exercises. *Gunnar Schulte*
- Guest lecturers will be invited in relation to more (all) course themes. *Mia von Knorring, Gert Helgesson, Ulrik Kihlbom, Anna Birgersdotter*
- Look into the possibility of rescheduling the course to not divided it into two parts. *Gunnar Schulte*
- Consider introducing the course differently, at the course introduction and earlier in the programme. It will be important to understand what “valuable skills” the students expected to learn but (according to the evaluation) did not and how to improve this for next year. *Gunnar Schulte and Hanna Jansson*

**Bilagor:** 4FF001 HT22 utan fritext