

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4NT005	Course title Professional development and communication in nutrition science	Credits 5
Semester Spring-23	Period Last period (May 15 th – June 2 nd)	
Course coordinator Maria Henström		Examiner Magdalena Rosell (Maria Henström examining teacher)
Teacher in charge of component Maria Henström		Other participating teachers/guest lecturers Maria Lundgren (KI), Leonie Klompstra (LiU), Anna Borgström (KIB), Anna Birgersdotter (UBE, KI), Prof Clare Collins (UoN, AUS), Richard Ball (UoN, AUS), Katy Chenoweth (Universal Impact), Malin Attefall (SVT), Madelen Lek (UBE, KI), Hanna Jansson (UBE, KI), Patrik Blomqvist (KI Innovations), Katie Trant (Hey Nutrition Lady).
Number of registered students during the three week check 32	Number approved on the last course date The final assignment was handed in on the last day of the course and graded thereafter. Twenty-six students got approved while six had to revise their assignment. In Sep-23, all students except one have submitted revisions and are now passed and graded on this course.	Response frequency course valuation survey 27 (84 %)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) At the end of the course we had an oral evaluation/discussion with the whole class where 26 of 32 students were present. Everyone got two post-it notes each and were asked to write 1-2 things on each: one thing they liked about the course, and one thing they wished (to improve, to be added, to be removed etc). The notes were put up on the whiteboard while the course coordinator did not look (to keep it anonymous) and the comments were then discussed together. All comments have been written down and saved in a separate document as part of the evaluation.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students The students were informed via an announcement at Canvas Aug 8 th 2023.		

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

This is the first time this course is given, and a similar course did not exist on the one-year programme. The course is the last course on the first year of the programme.

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

Overall, students seemed to enjoy the course. In the electronic course evaluation, the most common opinions of the course overall were Very Good (40.7%) and Good (22.2%) although seven students also answered Poor (25.9%) and the remaining three students either Ok or Very poor. The other answers in the electronic course evaluation varied but were often rated relatively high, especially for supervision/guidance and the teachers' openness to ideas and opinions, course structure and methods used, common theme during the course (constructive alignment), and relevant course assignments. The course was quite short and intense, but the

experienced workload seemed reasonable in relation to the course's credits (81.5% answered "reasonable") although the students could probably have spent more time on their studies (most students answered that they had put 25-35 hours per week for the course).

From all evaluations (electronic and in-classroom discussion), the course contains several well-appreciated activities, with students highlighting especially lectures and seminars on communicating science, storytelling, interview workshop, as well as activities related to writing a popular science article (main assignment) such as the 'pitch workshop' with an expert editor and the peer-feedback seminar. Students also provided some useful feedback for improvements (see below).

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

Strengths of the course: The course in general worked well regarding the content and structure. The students engaged in the course activities and seemed to find the course topics and the main assignment interesting and useful. They also appreciated that the teachers/course leader were supportive and available. The course is a bit different to the rest of the program, as it focuses on communicating - in an easy and understandable way - what they have learnt previously. Various guest lecturers were invited who work in different fields related to communication, both nationally and internationally, and all seemed to be very well appreciated. Strengths of the course include variation of learning methods, many discussions, practical exercises, as well the invited guest teachers/lecturers with different expertise.

Weaknesses of the course: The course is short (approx. 3 weeks) and this was something that the students highlighted as a limitation since they found the course content relevant. At the same time, they also suggested additional topics and aspects to add to the course. Several students believed the entrepreneurship module (2 days) should be improved, to be more 'hands-on' from start and more closely linked to nutrition science. They also mentioned that training in how to use LinkedIn would be more useful than hearing about Twitter (which a guest lecturer spoke about). Alumni students' presentations were highly appreciated but the students afterwards said they would have liked to hear these earlier during the programme, before deciding what to do for the second year of master's studies. They also would like to hear more examples from alumni working abroad. Furthermore, the course mostly focuses on communicating popular science in writing. This was highly appreciated by the students, but they also wished they had got more training in oral communication techniques and public speaking skills. A challenge with this course is that it runs in the end of the spring term. As students tend to want to go home/abroad for the summer break they sometimes request to be able to leave before the course ends, but then they miss a great part of the course and in-classroom activities that may be difficult to compensate for. In addition, AI tools poses a risk of writing assistance that is not currently allowed. Thus, the process of writing the popular science article during the course will have to be more supervised and controlled in the future.

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

Based on the comments, we have many ideas to consider for next year. Among other things, we will:

- schedule the alumni presentations earlier in the programme (during another course) before the students decide on year-2 activities. This will also release a few hours for other course content.

- discuss with responsible guest teachers how the entrepreneurship module can be improved and be even more applicable to the nutrition master's students.
- add more learning activities on public speaking and oral communication skills, including an oral presentation where the students get to pitch their popular science topic before writing about it. We will keep the appreciated "interview workshop" and lecture on storytelling.
- revise the journal club slightly (both structure and the examples used). During the journal club the students will analyse examples of popular science texts and discuss these both from a nutrition science perspective (what evidence it is based on and how that is presented accurately) as well as a communication skills perspective (how the written language is used to convey the message in an understandable way to the audience).
- go through more in detail how to accurately use references and other sources in a popular science article, as this information seemed to have been somewhat unclear last year.

Due to these changes, the course learning outcomes may be slightly revised for next year. AI tools will be discussed during the course introduction and written assignments (including compensatory assignments) will be structured in a way that minimizes the risk of using these tools in a non-accepted way. The course will also span over a few more days next time.