


Course evaluation - Health risk assessment, VT23

Respondents: 29
Answer Count: 22
Answer Frequency: 75.86%

In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.


In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	1 (4.5%)
to a large extent	13 (59.1%)
to a very large extent	8 (36.4%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, I have developed valuable expertise /skills during the course.	4.3	0.6	13.2 %	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.


In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	1 (4.5%)
to a large extent	8 (36.4%)
to a very large extent	13 (59.1%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.5	0.6	13.1 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.


In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	0 (0.0%)
to a large extent	5 (22.7%)
to a very large extent	17 (77.3%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.8	0.4	9.0 %	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).


In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	0 (0.0%)
to a large extent	10 (45.5%)
to a very large extent	12 (54.5%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	4.5	0.5	11.2 %	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.


In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	1 (4.5%)
to some extent	2 (9.1%)
to a large extent	4 (18.2%)
to a very large extent	15 (68.2%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.5	0.9	19.1 %	2.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded?


To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded?	Number of responses
far too little	0 (0.0%)
too little	0 (0.0%)
appropriate	19 (86.4%)
too much	2 (9.1%)
far too much	1 (4.5%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded?	3.2	0.5	15.7 %	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0

The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.


The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	3 (13.6%)
to a large extent	12 (54.5%)
to a very large extent	7 (31.8%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.2	0.7	15.9 %	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.


The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	3 (13.6%)
to a large extent	5 (22.7%)
to a very large extent	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.5	0.7	16.4 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

I was actively participating in learning activities.


I was actively participating in learning activities.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	2 (9.1%)
to a large extent	6 (27.3%)
to a very large extent	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
I was actively participating in learning activities.	4.5	0.7	14.8 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.

When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	Number of responses
to a very small extent	0 (0.0%)
to a small extent	0 (0.0%)
to some extent	0 (0.0%)
to a large extent	6 (27.3%)
to a very large extent	16 (72.7%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	4.7	0.5	9.6 %	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0

What is your overall experience of the course?


What is your overall experience of the course?	Number of responses
very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	1 (5.0%)
good	7 (35.0%)
very good	12 (60.0%)
Total	20 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
What is your overall experience of the course?	4.6	0.6	13.3 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Have you during the course been subjected to negative discrimination or insults because of your gender, ethnic origin, religion, disability or sexual orientation? If the answer is yes, the programme advises you to contact the study advisor or the student ombudsman; see KI webpage for Contact information.


Have you during the course been subjected to negative discrimination or insults because of your gender, ethnic origin, religion, disability or sexual orientation? If the answer is yes, the programme advises you to contact the study advisor or the student ombudsman; see KI webpage for Contact information.	Number of responses
Yes	1 (4.8%)
No	20 (95.2%)
Total	21 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
Have you during the course been subjected to negative discrimination or insults because of your gender, ethnic origin, religion, disability or sexual orientation? If the answer is yes, the programme advises you to contact the study advisor or the student ombudsman; see KI webpage for Contact information.	2.0	0.2	11.2 %	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

What was the reason for the negative discrimination or insult?


What was the reason for the negative discrimination or insult?	Number of responses
gender	0 (0.0%)
ethnic origin	1 (100.0%)
religion	0 (0.0%)
disability	0 (0.0%)
sexual orientation	0 (0.0%)
Total	1 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
What was the reason for the negative discrimination or insult?	2.0	0.0	NaN %	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

In my view, the lectures were:

In my view, the lectures were:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	2 (9.1%)
good	12 (54.5%)
very good	8 (36.4%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the lectures were:	4.3	0.6	14.8 %	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory exercise on web-based literature search was:


In my view, the mandatory exercise on web-based literature search was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	1 (4.5%)
ok	7 (31.8%)
good	9 (40.9%)
very good	5 (22.7%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory exercise on web-based literature search was:	3.8	0.9	22.3 %	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory exercises on Adverse effect and health-based guidance values was:


In my view, the mandatory exercises on Adverse effect and health-based guidance values was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	1 (4.5%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	16 (72.7%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory exercises on Adverse effect and health-based guidance values was:	4.7	0.6	12.1 %	3.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory workshop on benchmark dose modeling was:


In my view, the mandatory workshop on benchmark dose modeling was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	4 (18.2%)
good	4 (18.2%)
very good	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory workshop on benchmark dose modeling was:	4.5	0.8	18.0 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and Canvas quiz on Classification and Labelling were:


In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and Canvas quiz on Classification and Labelling were:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	5 (22.7%)
good	9 (40.9%)
very good	8 (36.4%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and Canvas quiz on Classification and Labelling were:	4.1	0.8	18.7 %	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and workshop on Toxicity testing for health risk assessment – principles and ethics was:


In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and workshop on Toxicity testing for health risk assessment – principles and ethics was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	7 (31.8%)
good	9 (40.9%)
very good	6 (27.3%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory individual assignment and workshop on Toxicity testing for health risk assessment – principles and ethics was:	4.0	0.8	19.9 %	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0

In my view, the mandatory seminar and group exercises on IARC classification was:


In my view, the mandatory seminar and group exercises on IARC classification was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	1 (4.5%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	16 (72.7%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory seminar and group exercises on IARC classification was:	4.7	0.6	12.1 %	3.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Chemicals Agency was:


In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Chemicals Agency was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	2 (9.1%)
good	7 (31.8%)
very good	13 (59.1%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Chemicals Agency was:	4.5	0.7	14.9 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory seminar on risk communication was:


In my view, the mandatory seminar on risk communication was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	1 (4.5%)
good	12 (54.5%)
very good	9 (40.9%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory seminar on risk communication was:	4.4	0.6	13.3 %	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Medical Products Agency was:


In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Medical Products Agency was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	3 (13.6%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Medical Products Agency was:	4.5	0.7	16.4 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Food Agency was:


In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Food Agency was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	3 (13.6%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the mandatory study visit to the Swedish Food Agency was:	4.5	0.7	16.4 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, the Epidemiology part (including lectures and mandatory exercises) was:


In my view, the Epidemiology part (including lectures and mandatory exercises) was:	Number of responses
Very poor	1 (4.5%)
poor	4 (18.2%)
ok	8 (36.4%)
good	3 (13.6%)
very good	6 (27.3%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the Epidemiology part (including lectures and mandatory exercises) was:	3.4	1.2	35.8 %	1.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0

In my view, the risk assessment case group work as a method of learning was:


In my view, the risk assessment case group work as a method of learning was:	Number of responses
very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	3 (13.6%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	14 (63.6%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the risk assessment case group work as a method of learning was:	4.5	0.7	16.4 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

In my view, to give and receive oral feedback from fellow students on the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was.


In my view, to give and receive oral feedback from fellow students on the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was:	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	1 (4.5%)
ok	3 (13.6%)
good	7 (31.8%)
very good	11 (50.0%)
Total	22 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, to give and receive oral feedback from fellow students on the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was.	4.3	0.9	20.7 %	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0

In my view, the oral presentations of the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was.

In my view, the oral presentations of the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was.	Number of responses
Very poor	0 (0.0%)
poor	0 (0.0%)
ok	4 (18.2%)
good	5 (22.7%)
very good	13 (59.1%)
Total	22 (100.0%)




	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
In my view, the oral presentations of the risk assessment group work as a learning activity was.	4.4	0.8	18.1 %	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

At KI, there is zero tolerance for discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, and abuse.

During your first year at the ToxMaster programme, in connection with your studies at KI, have you personally been subjected to any of the following? (you can choose more than one option)

At KI, there is zero tolerance for discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, and abuse.	
During your first year at the ToxMaster programme, in connection with your studies at KI, have you personally been subjected to any of the following? (you can choose more than one option)	
	Number of responses
Yes, Discrimination (to be treated disfavouredly or when a person's dignity is violated)	1 (4.5%)
Yes, Harassment (an offensive act that violates a person's dignity through spoken or written comments, gestures or exclusion)	1 (4.5%)
Yes, Sexual harassment (refers to unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature, such as comments, glares, pictures/films, stories, jokes, groping or propositions)	0 (0.0%)
No, I have not been subjected to any harassment or discrimination during my studies at the programme.	19 (86.4%)
I prefer not to answer	1 (4.5%)
Total	22 (100.0%)




	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
At KI, there is zero tolerance for discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, and abuse.								
During your first year at the ToxMaster programme, in connection with your studies at KI, have you personally been subjected to any of the following? (you can choose more than one option)	3.8	0.8	20.8 %	1.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0

If the answer is “YES” the programme advises you to contact the course or programme director, study counsellor or the student ombudspersons for help and support; see KI webpage for contact information.

<https://education.ki.se/student/masters-programme-in-toxicology/contact>
<https://education.ki.se/students-and-doctoral-students-ombudspersons>

If “YES”, was the discrimination/harassment in connection to: (you can choose more than one option)


If “YES”, was the discrimination /harassment in connection to: (you can choose more than one option)	Number of responses
Admission processes	0 (0.0%)
Lecture/seminar/laboratory	0 (0.0%)
Group work	1 (25.0%)
Examination (on site examination /take home examination)	0 (0.0%)
Student union activities	0 (0.0%)
Social media/ online forum, linked to you education learning platforms, digital platforms	0 (0.0%)
Other	1 (25.0%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0.0%)
Not applicable	2 (50.0%)
Total	4 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
If "YES", was the discrimination /harassment in connection to: (you can choose more than one option)	7.0	2.8	40.4 %	3.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0

If "YES", the person/s who subjected you was/were: (you can choose more than one option)

If "YES", the person/s who subjected you was/were: (you can choose more than one option)	Number of responses
Teacher(s)	0 (0.0%)
Supervisor(s)	0 (0.0%)
Other KI staff	0 (0.0%)
Other staff outside KI	0 (0.0%)
Student(s)	2 (66.7%)
Other	1 (33.3%)
Total	3 (100.0%)



	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
If "YES", the person/s who subjected you was/were: (you can choose more than one option)	5.3	0.6	10.8 %	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.5	6.0