Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4FF002	**Physiological and pharmacological mechanisms and experimental approaches**	**15**
Semester	**Period**	
VT25	**250224-250502**	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Anna Krook, Shane Wright	Anna Krook
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
43	**29**	76,7%

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)

Student oral feedback after each part of the course

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Via Canvas

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**

More study visits and journal clubs were added. An additional written assignment was added to give students the chance for a 4 day break between this and the next course (the last Friday was a "klämdag")

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

The VT25 iteration of the course Physiological and Pharmacological Mechanisms and Experimental Approaches was well received for content and clear focus on developing critical scientific skills. Students particularly valued the journal club format, which many described as one of the most effective and engaging components of the programme. It was widely seen as instrumental in promoting analytical thinking and improving confidence in reading and

discussing scientific literature. The practical elements of the course — including the glucose and NanoBRET experiments and a variety of study visits — were also highly appreciated for bringing theory into practice and offering hands-on insights into real-world research environments.
The course was praised for its breadth and relevance, with students highlighting the benefit of exposure to a wide range of experimental techniques and perspectives from guest lecturers across academia and industry. Assignments such as the poster presentation and research proposal were seen as valuable learning opportunities that helped build essential skills in scientific reasoning and communication.
At the same time, students offered constructive suggestions for improvement. Several noted that course scheduling and communication could be clearer and more consistent, particularly with regard to deadlines and room locations. While the course was considered intellectually stimulating, the workload — particularly in the final weeks — felt heavy for some, and students suggested a more balanced distribution of assignments. A clearer alignment between lecture content, learning outcomes, and the written exam would also support more effective preparation and reduce uncertainty. While many students appreciated the commitment of the teaching team, a few expressed a desire for more constructive and consistent feedback throughout.

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

Strengths of the course:

- **Study visits were appreciated for exposing students to different research labs and helping them explore personal interests.**
- **Individual assignment and presentation were well liked; students took them seriously and they encouraged independent thinking.**
- **Journal club format and varied pedagogical methods (e.g., seminars, discussions, posters) supported engagement and active learning.**

Weaknesses of the course:

- **Written exam was perceived as challenging; some students struggled with the format and felt unprepared.**
- **Group assignments received mixed feedback—some students noted unequal contributions from group members.**
- **Diverse backgrounds in the student group made it difficult to balance content to suit both less and more advanced students.**

4. Other views

There was general disappointment in the confusions and mismatch between TIme Edit and Canvas for the schedule. Students would appreciate the handouts being availbale in advance.

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

Structure: Align TimeEdit and Canvas consistently to avoid confusion about lecture times, locations, and deadlines. Publish all deadlines and assignment instructions clearly at the start of the course, including a consolidated schedule or checklist

Better exam preparation: We have already added a dedicated lecture or workshop early in the course on how to approach essay-style exam questions. This should help level the playing field for students unfamiliar with this format.

Improve group work dynamics: Implement clearer expectations or peer evaluations to encourage equal contribution in group assignments. Possibly reduce the weight of group work or provide more structured guidance during group tasks.

Support for varied backgrounds: We have offered an optional introductory sessions oon lab techniques for students who need it,

Adjust course pacing We will try to pace out lectures more evenly at the start of the course to reduce cognitive overload and allow more time for reflection. This is challenging given the timing of the course and availability of the lecturers

Appendices: