



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF010	Course title Advanced Human Physiology Research	Credits 7,5
Semester HT23	Period 2023-10-02 to 2023-11-03	

Course coordinator Rodrigo Fernandez-Gonzalo	Examiner Anna Wiik
Teacher in charge of component	Other participating teachers Tommy Lundberg, Mirko Mandic, Helene Rundqvist, Helena Wallin, Håkan Rundqvist, Lisa Eriksson,

Number of registered students during the three week check 12	Number approved on the last course date 8	Response frequency course valuation survey 58,33%
--	---	---

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Email contact with the course coordinator

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Open course web and 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: 231214

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

This is the first time the course is given so no changes were made.

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

Overall, the course was perceived as good and valuable for the future research of the students. Most students state that they reached the intended learning outcomes (3.9) and that there is a common theme running throughout the course (3.7). Importantly, the students believe the course promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (4.0). The students perceived that the teachers were open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content to certain extent (3.0). The methods and structure of the course was perceived as relevant (3.6) by the students, while the psychosocial work environment was perceived as Good to some extent (3.1). There was not much competition between students (1.9), and the students believe



they had sufficient previous knowledge to follow the course (4.1). The course was perceived as challenging to some extent (2.9).

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

Strengths of the course: According to the comments in the survey and the discussion with the students, the lab practices were very good. Most of the students would have liked to have more labs and a higher degree of translational physiology in the course, with the possibility to cut down content about clinical trials and GCP. The evaluation activities and the possibility to perform the final assignment in pairs (self-selected) was highlighted as a positive aspect of the course.

Weaknesses of the course: The main weakness highlighted by the students is the overlap with the content in other courses in relation to clinical trials and GCP. Also, the fact that the students (apparently) did not know that the course was in Huddinge, and the simple fact that the course was in Huddinge, was perceived as a negative aspect. Some students criticized some minor changes in the schedule regarding presentation of assignments.

4. Other views

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

This was the first time this course was performed, and overall it has been a very positive experience. We would have liked to have more background information about the previous courses the students have taken in the master's program to avoid content overlap. I am glad to see that the students appreciated the "researcher approach" to clinical trials and that they would have liked more content from specific advanced human physiology at the expense of general information on clinical trials and GCP.

Something that was a bit disappointing was the low attendance at the lectures (2-3 students on average!). We believe that this low attendance translated into a lower-than-expected quality of some of the written assignments needed to pass the course. For next year, we are thinking about offering some lectures remotely (e.g., intro lecture), and increasing the number of compulsory workshops where we believe the content is critical to fulfill the learning goals of the course.

The fact that the students complained about the location of the course is beyond our reach. We would suggest that the students received this information with more time in advance. It would be good if students were given clear information about the multi-campus structure of KI at the very beginning of the Master's program.

Appendices: