

Page: 1 / 2

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
1BI045	Pharmacology and Toxicology	10 HP
Semester	Period	
4	2023-03-27 to 2023-05-15	

Course coordinator	Examiner	
Duarte Ferreira	Duarte Ferreira	
Teacher in charge of component	Other participating teachers	
Magnus Olsson	Gunnar Schulte, Camilla Svensson, Göran Engberg,	
	Kent Jardemark, Oscar Jungholm, Lilly Schwieler,	
	Vesna Munic Kos, Sophie Erhardt, Max Bell, Jorge	
	Ruas, Mattias Carlström, Inger Johansson, Ralf	
	Morgenstern, Bengt Fadeel, Hilda Phan, Annika	
	Hanberg, Charlotte Nilsson, Farasat Zaman, Anda	
	Roxana Gilga, Imran Ali, Felipe de Oliveira Galvão,	
	Anna Beronius	

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey 51,02 %
49	43	31,02 %
	fluence (in addition to concluding course urse coordinator, course council, m	•
Feedback reporting of the country://sunet.artologik.net/ki	rse valuation results to the students /Admin/Survey/33741	

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 Canvas page was restructured to make it easy to find the different material. Each lecture has now the learning outcomes, lecture material and some YouTube videos that help students understand each topic.

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



Page: 1 / 2

Overall, the course was positively received. Overall, 52% of respondends stated that the course contributed to a "very large extent" to a development of valuable skills during the course (mean 4.5). Similarly, most students responded that they achieved the intended learning outcomes (mean 4.3) and that there was a comon theme running throughout the course (mean 4.6). The students moreover thought that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking with 88% of respondents stating that this goal was achieved to a "large extent" or "very large extent" (mean 4.3). The lowest score was received when answering whether the student has received feedback (mean 3.7). This is understandable, since we do not have a lot of active feedback moments in the course apart from the oral examination and the toxicology group presentation. The other moments of feedback, like self-assessment quizzes and mentimeter sessions are not understood as feedback by the students. However, the students felt that they could turn to the teacher/course coordinator for guidance (mean 4.6) The overall opinion of the course was considered very good (mean 4.6) with most of the students reporting that the course affected their mental health to a small extent (mean 2.2).

3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course *Strengths of the course:* The seminars and labs from Pharmacology were a strength of the course helping the students to reinforce concepts from the lectures ("labs were actually relevant for the exam. Seminars for pharmacology were very helpful for learning"). The lectures were also well received as well as the recorded lectures from Covid years so students could revise the topics even if they are not up to date ("the lectures were clear and had good structure."; "I highly appreciate the lecture recordings being available. They are very useful for understanding material and remembering because they can be played as many times as needed."). The Q&A seminar for the toxicology part was also well received by the students ("the compilation of the seminar Q&As made studying for the exam a lot easier"). It was also praised the organisation of the course ("Organization was very good! Slides always available, the activities during the course made sense and helped with the intended learning.").

Weaknesses of the course: Some points were indicated by the students as a potential improvement. They mentioned that we should have a wet lab since it has been an year since the last wet lab they had. They also mentioned that the Toxicology group work could be more like a learning activity as a preparation for the exam. Also, the Toxicology part on Canvas should follow the Pharmacology part. It was also mentioned that in some lecture both Swedish and English was used which confused the students. Finally, more information should be given regarding the oral exam in Pharmacology.

- 4. Other views
- 5. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

Revise of the Canvas page so the Pharmacology and Toxicology parts look similar; Check that the lecture material has only information in English and no Swedish is used; Revise the group



Page: 1 / 2

work for Toxicology part to make it more applicable to the exam study	; Double check that there
are no repetitions between lectures; Organise more self-assessment q	uizzes

Appendices: