

## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 4BI107	<b>Course title</b> Frontiers in Biomedicine	<b>Credits</b> 10.5
<b>Semester (VT/HT-yr)</b> HT22 (autumn 2022)	<b>Dates</b> 29 <sup>th</sup> August – 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	

<b>Course Director</b> Rachel Fisher	<b>Examiner</b> Rachel Fisher
<b>Teachers in charge of different parts of the course</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circulation, Metabolism and Endocrinology: Jurga Laurencikienė + Ljubica Matic</li> <li>• Cell Biology, Development and Regeneration: Matti Nikkila, Karolina Kublickienė + Lena Ström</li> <li>• Immunology and Infection: Benedict Chambers</li> <li>• Neuroscience: Fredrik Piehl, Maria Ankarcróna + Lennart Brodin</li> <li>• Tumour Biology: Margareta Wilhelm</li> <li>• Course Administrator: Mari Liljefors</li> </ul>	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Within each “track” there were a number of different teachers with expertise in the different topics that were covered.  In addition, the course contained a “generic track” with three focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic writing: Gabrielle Ekman</li> <li>• Rhetoric: Peter Lind</li> <li>• Ethics: Ulrik Kihlbom</li> </ul>

<b>Number of registered students at the 3-week check</b> 45	<b>Number passed at final course day</b> 36 (9 students were required to submit revisions of an assignment)	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 82.2%
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) A course council, open to all students, was held close to the end of the course (7 <sup>th</sup> October). The meeting was held in Zoom and most of the students participated. Minutes were taken (by a student representative) and placed on Canvas. During the course, students were encouraged to give feedback directly to the course director or track leaders. It was also possible to post feedback on Canvas. Contact with the course administrator was encouraged.		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students</b> 2022-10-28 (survey placed on courses webpages in both Canvas and Drupal)		

### Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students’ course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also to the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 2023-06-26  
 The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2023-06-26

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

- An extended introduction to the course was held, clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations, timelines etc.
- There was an improved introduction to each of the tracks clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc.
- The organisation of the generic track, including the topics for each of the assignments was clarified.

- The journal club was standardised across the tracks, including allocation of students to their journal club groups/journal club articles.
- The track responsible teachers were requested to ensure that the length of lectures did not exceed 30-40 minutes.
- The research project fair was restructured so that students could prepare better beforehand and find their way around more easily.

## **2. Brief summary of the students' evaluation of the course**

*(Based on the students' quantitative responses to the course valuation and key views from free text responses. Quantitative summary and any graphs are attached.)*

In general, the students were satisfied with the course and appreciated the design that provided a good introduction to KI, the programme and to one another. Although the course was considered to be challenging, this was generally viewed in a positive light and the course was deemed to be rewarding. However, the design of the course and the multiple assignments was found stressful at times. The course was viewed to have promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning

## **3. The Course Director's reflections on the implementation and results of the course**

### ***Strengths of the course:***

- A broad introduction to research and researchers at KI, achieved through lectures, journal clubs, tasks/assignments and research project fair
- Research project fair providing opportunities for students and researchers to come in to contact with one another and for the students to find potential labs in which to perform their research projects (beneficial for students and researchers alike)
- Generic track providing training in scientific writing, ethics and rhetoric
- Multiple opportunities to give oral presentations and to learn from this (combined with the rhetoric part of the generic track)
- Group work providing multiple opportunities for students to get to know one another (important since the first course in the programme)
- A range of different assignments
- A course that was challenging, but rewarding
- An emphasis on critical thinking and analysis
- Excellent track organisers + engaged and enthusiastic teachers
- Structured organisation of the course web on Canvas providing access to information and course material, combined with excellent course administration

### ***Weaknesses of the course:***

- The introduction to the course as a whole and to the component tracks needs to be improved/reorganised to provide the students with the relevant information at the right time, and provide clarity regarding design/organisation/expectations
- Too intensive at times with short deadlines
- Sometimes too many lectures/day, and teachers not keeping to time and/or providing too much information
- Uneven "depth" in different tracks: "state-of-the-art" generally appreciated, but some parts were felt to be too basic/general

- Variable organisation of assignments (journal clubs and tasks) in the different tracks leading to confusion and frustration amongst students
- Organisation of the research project fair – not easy to get an overview of the participating labs and where to find them at the fair

### 3. Other views

Generally, the course ran well. Students and teachers enjoyed the format, which allowed for extensive interaction and discussion. Teachers were impressed by the performance of the students. The course promotes critical thinking and analysis, as well as providing an introduction to KI and the Master's Programme in Biomedicine. Many of the areas for improvement relate to communication and how information is transferred (both to students and to track leaders/teachers). This is a learning process for the course leadership, given the complex organisation of the course, and addressing these issues is a continuous process.

### 4. Course Director's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

*(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)*

- Refine the introduction to the course clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc, but without making it too long.  
Responsible = Course Director  
Implement in the first two days of the course in HT23
- Continue to improve the introduction to each of the tracks to clarify the organisation, goals, expectations etc  
Responsible = Track leaders  
Implement at the start of each track block in HT23
- Standardise the organisation of the journal clubs in Canvas across the tracks (including the format for the submission of the discussion questions).  
Responsible = Course Director/track leaders/course administrator  
Implement HT23
- Hold the workshop on using sources and paraphrasing at the start of the course so that students can implement what they learn in the course's assignments.  
Responsible = Course Director  
Implement HT23
- Increase discussion and activities to promote student participation in the bioethics workshop.  
Responsible = Course Director/bioethics teacher  
Implement HT23
- Ensure lectures no longer than 30-40 minutes (and do not over run their scheduled time).  
Responsible = Track leaders (to inform lecturers and ensure timing is adhered to)  
Implement HT23
- Continue to improve the organisation and structure of the research project fairs so that students can prepare appropriately and find the researchers they wish to talk to more easily, and researchers have good opportunities to meet and interact with the students.  
Responsible = Course Director/course administrator  
Implement HT23
- Review grading within the course and discuss with track leaders to ensure similar assessment procedures, marking, grading etc.



Responsible = Course Director/track leaders

Implement discussion and review of practices prior to start of course in HT23

**Appendices:**

Course survey HT22