Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4NT026	Professional development and communication in nutrition science	5
Semester	**Period**	
Spring-25	Last period (May 13th – June 5th)	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Maria Henström Engblom	Magdalena Rosell (Maria Henström Engblom as examining teacher)
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers/guest lecturers**
Maria Henström Engblom	Maria Lundgren (KI), Gabriella Ekman (KIB), Anna Birgersdotter (UBE, KI), Francesca Del Gaudio (KI Career Service), Katy Chenoweth (Universal Impact), Nina Kägi-Braun (KI), Leonard Thu-Hohenstein (IQVIA), Samer Yammine (UBE, KI), Katie Trant (Hey Nutrition Lady), Sara Ask (dietitian, author).

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
29	-	15 (50 %)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) At the end of the course we had an oral evaluation with those students who were there (approx. two-thirds of the students). It was an open discussion and the course leader wrote down the main points afterwards.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students The students were informed via an announcement at Canvas Sep 8th 2025 (course valuation and analysis).		

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

The course worked very well last year so we kept most parts similar this year. However, some changes were done. On day 1, we included a Mentimeter survey to map the student's previous experiences from popular science writing/speaking or entrepreneurship/innovation as well as their future career plans. The purpose was to let the student begin to reflect upon their own professional development. The results (anonymised) were also shared with teachers to better prepare the lectures. Furthermore, since last year's students asked for more time dedicated to the entrepreneurship module to be able to apply their knowledge, we added a third session this year, which included a group exercise where students got to create and present an innovation. Since the guest lecturer in entrepreneurship and innovation could only lecture during the last week of the course, we had the oral presentations the week before. This worked well although it might have been better to have the oral presentations in the end of the course. The oral presentations were scheduled for two days with half the class each day. This worked well as it contributed to a comfortable size of audience for the students to present to, while the other half of the class got time to work on their written assignments that day.

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

Again, students were happy with the course. The answers in the electronic course evaluation were very positive and overall opinion of the course scored even higher than last year: 'Very good' (87% compared to 68%) with an average score of 4.9 (to compare with 4.7 previous year, and 3.7 year 2023). All respondents also answered "To a very large extent" (73%) or "To a large extent" (27%) to the statement about whether the examinations were relevant in

relation to the learning outcomes. Although the course is short and intense, 100% replied the workload was ‘reasonable’.

Based on free-text responses and classroom discussions, the course includes well-received activities. Students described it as practical and useful, highlighting various elements as “the best aspects.” They also valued the support and guidance provided. When asked for improvements, several students said they were satisfied and suggested no changes. Others proposed reducing the amount of information or allow more time to process entrepreneurship workshops. One student recommended adding professional-client communication in the course, if time permits. In the oral evaluation, students suggested improvements such as receiving feedback on their ‘pitch to the editor’, getting more hands-on career advice from the guest speakers, and shortening group discussion session times during seminars.

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

The course has now been running for a few years and works well overall. The inclusion of practical learning activities, such as group discussions, interviewing exercise, writing and oral presentations, are appreciated and engaging, and is important for students’ learning in communicating nutrition science.

Use of AI is a challenge. Students may use AI for feedback on their writing (not to generate new text), submitting an AI declaration and reflection which their assignment. This works well, but as AI use evolves and varies, it would be helpful to address this more during the course. For example, we could offer some practical guidance on writing prompts and using AI tools effectively and responsibly, while highlighting their risks and limitations.

Another challenge is assessing students’ ability to interpret and communicate nutrition science in an evidence-based way. While students value the freedom to choose their own topic to write about, this makes grading more complex and time-consuming – especially when they select topics not very familiar to the examining teacher. To address this, I will revise next year’s instructions to limit topic choices (see below).

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

Overall, the course now has a well-functioning structure and is appreciated by the students. According to feedback, it complements the previous courses during their masters’ program and equips students with new and useful skills for their future career.

Most of the current structure and teaching activities will remain next year. However, based on students’ feedback and the course leader’s own reflections, a few adjustments are planned:

- Assignment templates for writing the pitch and popular science article will be provided to ensure students include all parts such as the AI declaration and reflection which was incomplete in several submitted assignments last year and required resubmissions.
- Topic selection will be limited to be framed around a set of systematic reviews chosen by the course coordinator. We then plan to include a second journal club where these articles are discussed in groups, before students work individually to frame their topic and target audience freely around at least one of these articles to stay evidence-based.
- Explore possibility to introduce a practical exercise on how using generative AI can support their learning, writing and/or planning of oral presentations, and/or discussions on potential use of AI in their future work.