

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4NT005	Course title Professional development and communication in nutrition science	Credits 5
Semester Spring-24	Period Last period (May 8 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), Gabriella Ekman (KIB), Anna Birgersdotter (UBE, KI), Prof Clare Collins (UoN, AUS), Matt Warren (Universal Impact), Ana Oliviera Osorio (KI career service), Samer Yammine (UBE, KI), Katie Trant (Hey Nutrition Lady), Sara Ask (dietitian, author).
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. Ten students had to revise their assignment (mostly minor revisions). In Sep-23, all students except one have submitted revisions, which means 31/32 are currently approved.	Response frequency course valuation survey 19 (59 %)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) At the end of the course we had an oral evaluation/discussion with those students who were there (approx. 22 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 16 th 2024 (both course valuation and course analysis).		

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

This was the second time the course is given, and although the course was well-received already last year, some changes were made this year to improve it. The course started with a short welcome-video by me (the course coordinator) and individual preparatory work in the morning of the first day, so that we could kick-start the course with the first seminar after the roll call after lunch. The journal club had a new format where students analysed actual articles from “The Conversation”. Because we removed the “career day” with alumni presentations (this was arranged earlier in the programme because of feedback from last year) we got some time to include new lectures: LinkedIn (KI career service) and a guest lecture by a dietitian and book author. More focus was also given to public speaking skills (related to the 3rd learning outcome on the course) since students last year wished they would have gotten more training in oral communication. This year, students got to present their chosen topic in the end of the course in a 3-min popular science oral pitch and then provide peer-feedback to each other. The reflection (one of the written assignments) was further developed and included both an education/learning reflection as well as a professional development plan. Finally, AI tools were allowed to support the students when working on their popular science article

(allowed for feedback and improvements but not to write new text). Thus, all students were required to also write an AI disclosure and reflection to submit together with the assignment.

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

Overall, students seemed to be happy with the course. The answers in the electronic course evaluation were very positive and were significantly improved compared to last year: the overall opinion of the course was 'very good' (68%) or 'good' (32%) with an average score of 4.7 (to compare with 3.7 previous year). Although the course is short and intense, the workload seemed to be reasonable; most students spent 25-35 hour/week on the course, and 90% replied the workload was 'reasonable'.

Based on free-text answers in the electronic valuation, as well as in-classroom discussions, the course contains well-appreciated activities. Students highlighted the workshop with an editor from Universal Impact as particularly useful (discussing popular science writing), but other lectures and seminars/workshops on popular science communication were also mentioned. Guest lectures were appreciated and described as inspiring. Overall, students found the course interesting, well organised and "fun", the course leader and lecturers were helpful and approachable, course material was relevant, and the course gave new valuable knowledge with no repetition from previous courses on the programme. During the oral evaluation, students also said they enjoyed the 3-min pitch presentations which ended the course.

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

Strengths of the course: The course worked very well in terms of structure, content and students' engagement – it is a fun course to lead. The course is supposed to give students new and useful skills to complement previous courses, so that they will feel comfortable communicating nutrition science in writing and speaking to non-expert audiences. I also try to highlight the students' role in future work, and the importance of being able to communicate this topic in a balanced and evidence-based way. It was rewarding to see the students' engagement in the different activities during the course, and several of them commented in their reflection assignment that the course had given them skills they didn't know they needed. Strengths of the course include the variation of active learning methods used, as well as the broad expertise and backgrounds represented by the invited guest teachers/lecturers.

Weaknesses of the course: The major challenge on this course for me as a course leader, is to fit all relevant teaching activities in such a short period (~3 weeks) without making it too intense for the students. The course has several learning outcomes, and the topic is broad, which makes it challenging to prioritize what lectures should be included and not. However, this year I think we found a good balance in terms of relevant course content in relation to workload for students.

Another challenge on this course is how to handle the use of AI. However, we had discussions between the course leader and students regarding this and although AI can be useful for improving popular science texts, one needs to be particularly careful to not trust its answers in this course. This is because students typically write about topics that are misinterpreted or misinformed in different media online; consequently, these misinterpretations may be reflected in the AI response. This was an interesting aspect of the usefulness of AI in nutrition science communication. The AI disclosures and reflections that students were instructed to

write were useful, but next year I will need to provide examples and more structure for this so that they know better what is expected.

The entrepreneurship module is an important part of the course but because the course is short there is limited time allocated to this. It is also often an unknown field for students. This year we had a new lecturer on this module, and we framed it more around innovation to make it applicable to nutrition science students. This was appreciated and most students found those lectures interesting and useful. However, they also wished they had gotten the opportunity to apply some of the methods in practice, thus, I would like to add a practical exercise next year.

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

Overall, the course now has a good format and works well. Most teaching activities will be kept as is, with only minor adjustments needed. However, based on students' feedback and the course leader's own reflections, some things to consider for next year include:

- While some students felt that certain instructions were repeated too much, it was also clear from the submitted assignments that other instruction need to be more clearly communicated, such as how to write the AI disclosure and reflection (show examples from last year) and how to correctly hyperlink text to sources in a pdf.
- Discuss with responsible guest teachers how we can include a practical exercise in the entrepreneurship module, applicable to the nutrition master's students.
- Give more clear instructions on what to focus on when giving peer-feedback to each other at the 3-min oral presentations (i.e., content/message, presentation skills, etc).
- Explore possibility to introduce a practical exercise on graphical presentation skills during the course, such as infographics or social media content.