# Course analysis (course evaluation)

| Course code | Course title | Credits |
|---|---|---|
| 4FF013 | **Information literacy: searching, writing and presenting science** | **4** |
| **Semester** | **Period** | |
| **HT25** | **250901-251709** | |

| Course coordinator | Examiner |
|---|---|
| **Duarte Ferreira** | Jessica Norrbom |
| **Teacher in charge of component** | **Other participating teachers** **Lina Lindstein, Emilie Lindström, Gabriella Ekman, Müjde Nordling** |

| Number of registered students during the three week check | Number approved on the last course date | Response frequency course valuation survey |
|---|---|---|
| 21 | **21** | 77,27% |
| **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** | | |

**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: 2025-12-10

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

We clarified the learning outcomes and the guidelines for the review and the poster so students know exactly what each part should contain. In addition, we introduced structured feedback using rubrics, exemplars, and directed peer-review prompts so comments are consistent, actionable, and lead to faster, targeted improvement.

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

Students reported high overall satisfaction and felt the course was well organised and aligned with the ILOs, indicating that the design supports learning coherently. They especially appreciated the supportive climate, the practical database/search training, and the poster session, which shows that key skills were clearly transferred in a safe learning environment. They suggested moving the presentation workshop before the poster submission, reducing the heavy workload in week one, and adding optional advanced content, changes that would make

the timing more useful and the challenge appropriate for different skill levels.

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

***Strengths of the course:*** **Students demonstrated strong engagement and ownership of learning, with very high ratings for feeling included and respected (mean 5.9) and being encouraged to take responsibility (mean 5.6). They reported clear expectations (mean 5.2), strong alignment between activities and ILOs (mean 5.4), and found feedback genuinely useful (mean 5.4). Qualitative comments show they leveraged teacher and peer feedback to improve drafts, gained confidence with database searching (PubMed, MeSH, Web of Science), and benefited notably from the poster presentations for communication skills and scientific storytelling. These patterns suggest a motivated, collaborative cohort able to apply guidance quickly and work constructively in low-stakes, supportive settings.**

***Weaknesses of the course:*** **A subset entered with higher prior skills and perceived parts of the content as too basic, asking for more advanced material and a conference-like poster format; workshop engagement felt uneven for some, and active-learning opportunities were rated only moderate (mean 4.4). Students also flagged that late sequencing (presentation workshop after poster submission) blunted their ability to act on advice, and several described week-one workload as front-loaded, which strained time management for research-question scoping and first drafts. Finally, because the course's aim is not problem-solving per se, students rated that growth area lower (mean 4.2) and some peer-feedback comments remained variable in depth despite being helpful overall, signals that calibration and timing improvements would better match the cohort's spread of prior knowledge.**

**4. Other views**

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

**We will move the presentation/pitch workshop to precede the poster deadline so students can apply delivery and design tips before submitting. Immediately after the first search workshop, we will add a short "search-to-outline" clinic to improve scoping and reduce churn during drafting. We will tighten the review-feedback-revision loop by using a calibrated rubric so feedback becomes reliably constructive and revisions more efficient. We will run a brief poster pre-check to catch readability and design issues before printing and presenting.**

**Appendices:**