Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4FF010	**Advanced human physiology research**	**7,5**
Semester	**Period**	
HT24	**241007-241110**	

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

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
8	**7**	62,5%

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Email contact with the course coordinator and/or the other teachers

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: 2025-01-27

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

We have condensed the teaching activities in the course so that students do not have to spend more days than ncessary on campus Huddinge, which they complained about last year. We also eliminated some lectures on Data Management and Ethical Issues (but the material was available in Canvas), as we know that students have already covered part of this content in previous courses. We gave students two opportunities to present and discuss their ideas for the various mandatory assignments, and they received real-time feedback on their plans. This was introduced as some students perceived some ambiguity in relation to their assignments. I must say that this has significantly improved the quality of the assignments that students have submitted this year.

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 have developed valuable expertise/skills during the couse (3.2), and that they have achived all the ILOs of the course (3,6). There was a perception that there was a common threme running throughout the couse (3,6), and that the course has promoted scientific way of thinking (3,6). The feedback on the openess of the teachers is also positive (3,6), similarly to that for the course's structure and methods (3,6). The psychosocial environment was perceived as good (3,4), and the student did not experienced a high degree of competition among them during the course (2,4). The students think that their previous knowledge seemed to be sufficient for the course (3,6), and that the course was not especially challenging (2,8).

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

Strengths of the course: **In the survey, emails and personal conversations, students highlighted the commitment of the teaching staff as one of the greatest strengths of the course. They appreciated the energy that the teaching team put into all lectures and the variety in the teaching methods we used. Some students stated that the course was coherent and well thought out. This year I am very pleased with the performance of most of the students. They submitted very good projects and were able to defend and discuss almost all the details of the assignment, which indicates that they put a lot of time and thought into it. The students also mentioned that some of the compulsory seminars, such as the seminar "Evaluation of published CT protocols", and the practical demonstrations were very good,,**

Weaknesses of the course: **We received comments on some content overlaps with previous courses. This cannot be completely avoided as we need to ensure that this content is understood in the context of human physiology research. To compensate for this, we try to provide examples and content that really relate to human physiology research (although the general components may also apply to drug trials, for example).**

4. Other views

n/a

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

This is the second time we have offered this course and we feel that the quality has increased and students are more engaged in the course. As mentioned earlier, we introduced a compulsory seminar (final project) and an optional workshop (SOP) in which students presented their ideas for the assignments and two teachers gave real-time feedback based on the grading criteria for each assignment. This significantly improved the quality of work and aligned teacher and student expectations.

This year, the course ran alongside a free-standing course. This was a challenge at the beginning, but in the end we had a great group of mixed students who collaborated with each

other and increased the amount and quality of discussion during the various events in the course.

For future courses, I would like to discuss the other courses in the master's program that are running at the same time as this course. Several students in the master's program contacted me and told me that they would have liked to participate in this course, but the schedule with the other courses in the program did not make it possible.

Appendices: