Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4NT026	Professional development and communication in nutrition science	5
Semester	**Period**	
Spring-26	Last period (May 11th – June 7th)	

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), Linne Hedin (KI), Gabriella Ekman and Anna Borgström (KIB), Anna Birgersdotter (UBE, KI), Ana Oliviera (KI Career Service), Katy Chenoweth (Universal Impact), Samer Yammine (UBE, KI), Katie Trant (Hey Nutrition Lady), Sara Ask (dietitian, author), and 3 PhD students as assistants (Daniel Södersberg, Helén Eke and Mira Akber).

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
31	After grading the assignments in June, 30 students were approved on the course.	15 (48 %)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) At the end of the course we had an oral evaluation with half the class each day (presentation days). 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 Oct 5th 2026 (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, several changes were made. We had the course introduction online and the students then had the first day to read through the Canvas pages and prepare for the upcoming seminars and journal club. They filled in the same introductory survey as last year, but also chose what topic they wished to work with during the course. A larger change from last year was that, instead of choosing any topic, the students got to choose from one of 8 topic areas. Four students worked within each topic area but were encouraged to develop their own angle, story, and target audience. The purpose was to enable students to support each other in the process, while making it easier for me as a course leader to see that they could communicate scientific evidence appropriately; each topic had a core article they had to include in the evidence base. This meant we also spent half the journal club on analysing the core articles in groups before moving on the popular science articles. Furthermore, a second peer-feedback seminar was included, focusing on the pitch-to-editor. And a quiz (made in Canvas) on popular science writing was introduced, which the students were tasked to complete in pairs in the classroom before the peer-feedback. The purpose was to use retrieval practice and peer learning to help students recall knowledge from the lectures on popular science communication while preparing them to provide feedback to one another. Finally, the reflection assignment was further developed and included reflections on key mandatory activities that directly relate to the course learning outcomes. The schedule allowed for having the 3 min presentations in the end of the course, which was a nice way of ending it.

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

As in previous years, students were very satisfied 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 with an average score of 5.3 (to compare with 4.9 in 2025, 4.7 in 2024, and 3.7 in 2023).

Based on free-text responses and classroom discussions, the course includes well-received activities. Students reported that the course provided them with new skills and different perspectives. They mentioned, among other things, peer-feedback and feedback during oral presentations as particularly valuable, as well as the various practical applications of their previous knowledge through both written and oral exercises and assignments.

When asked for improvements, the most common comment was around the schedule, where entrepreneurship workshops and presentations were performed within the same week as the final 3-min pitch presentations. This was perceived as quite intense, so they suggested more time in-between. Students also suggested moving the peer-feedback seminar on the written assignment slightly later in the course to allow enough time to work on the draft first. Finally, like previous years, several students commented that they would have liked the course to be longer as they appreciated its content and would have liked to engage more with it.

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 various practical learning activities are appreciated by students. I have observed that students engage actively in the learning activities, which appears to support their learning. However, as a course leader I will continue to look for opportunities to streamline the course and make it as effective and useful as possible for the students.

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

Overall, the course has developed into a well-structured and well-received component of the programme. Student feedback suggests that it complements and builds on previous courses in the programme and provides valuable new competencies and perspectives that are relevant to future careers.

Based on students' feedback and the course leader's own reflections, next year's schedule will allow more time in between oral presentations to avoid a too intense last week. Letting students work in "topic groups" for their individual work, facilitated peer support during the course and appeared to be appreciated by students. This structure will be kept for next year. However, generative AI is still a challenge. The inclusion of an AI workshop as well as written AI declaration and reflection in their submitted examination assignment, helps students understand the benefits and challenges of using AI in learning. To further support students' learning and the responsible use of AI, I plan to introduce a written examination next year. In this examination, students will answer questions related to their submitted popular science article, including their writing process, their application of communication techniques taught during the course, and their use of AI tools. This approach will allow assessment of both the final product and the underlying process, while encouraging reflection, responsible AI use, and alignment with the course learning outcomes.