Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4FF004	**Bioinformatics from a Physiological and Pharmacological Perspective**	**7,5**
Semester	**Period**	
VT25	**250120-250221**	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Volker Lauschke	Gunnar Schulte
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**
Sofiene Laarif, Yitian Zhou, Roman Tremmel, Tom Erkers, Sonia Youhanna, Magdalena Scharf, Lucie Delemotte, Gustaw Eriksson	**Stefania Koutsilieri, Aurino Kemas, Sabine Willems**

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
45	**45**	56,82%

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

Email contact with course coordinator

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Via Canvas

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: 200115
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 200115

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

The exam included also free-text questions in addition to Single Best Answer questions.

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

Overall, the course was positively received. 72% of respondents stated that the course contributed to a "large extent" or "very large extent" to a development of valuable skills during the course (mean 3.7). This is an increase compared to the last course of +0.2 points. Similarly, all students responded that they achieved the intended learning outcomes to at least some extent (mean 3.9, as in the recent year). The vast majority of students answered that the course has promoted their scientific thinking and reasoning (mean 3.8; -0.2 compared to the previous year). As in previous years, the lowest scores were received when answering

whether the previous knowledge was sufficient (mean 2.9) and whether the course was sufficiently challenging (mean 3.4). This is understandable, as the very aim of module was to provide an overview of the diversity of different modeling approaches used for physiological and pharmacological applications, i.e. to touch upon a number of methodologically different tools. That both opposing questions received similar answers is a reflection of the diversity of students admitted to the course from drastically varying academic backgrounds. Consequently, we do not believe that the course should be made either easier or harder per se. Notably, the work environment was considered good (mean 4.0) with very limited competition between students (mean 2.2).

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

Strengths of the course: **The engagement of the teachers and their willingness to contribute to the new course and the continuous development of the course. The lectures were considered informative and structured throughout. The combination between lectures and practical elements felt well balanced and the workshops were considered as helpful elements.**

Weaknesses of the course: **More time for self-study and communication of materials and organizational aspects more well in advance. The course organization was more difficult due to a 30% increase in student numbers compared to previous years.**

4. Other views

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

The structure of the course with lectures and practical courses has proved itself to be suitable to convey the learning objectives. As such, no major changes are planned. We plan to heed the feedback and aim for a more clear presentation of the course structure early on during the module.

Appendices: