

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4B1114	Course title Frontiers in Biomedicine: Research Project 1	Credits 15hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT23	Period March 22 - June 4, 2023	

Course coordinator Bernhard Lohkamp	Examiner Bernhard Lohkamp
Teacher in charge of component	Other participating teachers various

Number of registered students during the three week check 46	Number approved on the last course date 46	Response frequency course valuation survey 69.6%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) N/A		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Survey (without comments) published on Canvas course page (and on open Kursweb Drupal). Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey. Meeting with course representative to discuss survey and analysis. Will be presented at the start of next course.		

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: **14/07/23**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 14/07/23

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

Course information was sent out in good time and a following (virtual) Q&A session was conducted.

Progress meetings were slightly more spread out (difficult due to the holidays during the course). Comments on the reflections of the meetings were removed. The topics for the discussion in the 2nd meeting were adjusted to include progression and changes from/based on the 1st meeting.

To allow extra words e.g. for figure legends, the word count for the project report was (indirectly) increased by taking out Materials and Methods from the counting.

Assessment criteria have been revised as not to favour students with good pre-knowledge but allow progression to be assessed correspondingly. The overall assessment was split into 4 (project report, project activity, method discussion and presentation/discussion).

Several aspects of the course have been clarified to the students, e.g. student selection for the examination groups, short deadlines for some assessments etc.. An extra meeting with examining teachers was conducted to unify the discussion/presentation sessions incl. grading.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations 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.)

The course appears to be appreciated by the students as it provides an opportunity to do research, learn new methods, get to know research groups etc. Students developed new skills and trained scientific thinking and reasoning. Communication and information about the course appear to be intricate to access and unclear at times. Furthermore, the examination session continues to prove challenging in concept to students and examining teachers alike and requires more even clarifications.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course allows the students to learn a new method in the context of a short research project. This is an excellent opportunity to learn (new) methods, get acquainted with research in general and research groups at KI in particular. This allows students early on to build a network in scientific research. Students appreciate their own choice of research topic and group. Very relevant assessment using discussion session. Project meetings give students opportunities to discuss, meet, reflect on their project and progress.

Weaknesses of the course:

Information flow was at times too intense so that not everything could be processed and there was lack of information (or emphasis thereof) at other places. Added workload due to the progress meetings esp. the corresponding, written reflections. More feedback on writing could be provided.

3. Other views

By mistake some questions were duplicated in the survey.

It was missed to inform students about implemented changes at the beginning of the course.

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

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

Information meetings for this and other courses will be better spread out to not overload students with information (BLo, J. Laurencikiene, M. Jonegård).

Several aspects of the course will be clarified to the students, e.g. adherence to deadlines for VG, word count details, discussion session format. This will be in conjunction with updating of the Canvas page to streamline information content. An additional (online) meeting/Q&A session closer to the end of the course, i.e. examination session and project report writing, will be arranged to better inform students about the different tasks (BLo).

Progress meetings will be reviewed again to spread out more and include more progression. Replacing one of the reflection by a self-reflection survey will be evaluated (BLo, C. McGrath).

It will be considered to use moderated assessment in Canvas for the project report which will allow more feedback directly in Canvas as well as a unified assessment. At the same time the assessment criteria for the report could be more specified for the respective sections of the report giving already indirect feedback (and instructions) on these (BLo, C. McGrath).

Even though supervisors and examiners have been clearly informed of their duties it appears they not always adhere to it. The course director will ensure that examining teachers are (better) aware of scope of the course, the format of the assessment as well as assessment criteria (BLo). Similarly, supervisors will be reminded about their role e.g. in assessment etc. (BLo). An extension of the discussion session will be considered to allow students more time for discussion.

Note: the examination session in form of a round-the-table discussion should not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination and hence different to other used ones and a very real situation. Sadly, this is very often misunderstood by the students (and even some examining teachers). In the future we will avoid the use of presentation and power-point and rather use *discussion* and *figures* in an attempt to avoid confusion with full on presentation using a presentation software package.

Appendices:

Survey