

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 5MT013	Course title Biostatistics	Credits 6
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT-2025	Dates 2025-11-10 – 2026-01-18	

Course Director Keith Humphreys	Examiner Keith Humphreys
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course Rickard Strandberg, Keith Humphreys, Nghia Vu, Elisavet Syriopoulou	Other participating teachers Robert Karlsson

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 34	Number passed at final course day 23	Response frequency course valuation survey 16/34 (47%)
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) Course council with 8 students in attendance		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students Students have received a summary		

Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also to the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: TBD

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: TBD

1. Description of changes implemented since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students, and in relation to the Course Director's conclusions and suggestions for change in the previous course analysis. If changes proposed in the previous course analysis have not been implemented, please explain why

The course ran over a longer period than in the previous two years. All changes proposed in last year's course analysis were implemented. We for example, handed out the assignment much earlier in the course and made changes to the assignment to include material covered later on in the course. We also made changes to the journal club with the intention of improving feedback during the period in which students prepared presentations. We handed out the articles earlier and allowed more time for the students to discuss the articles with the teachers.

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

(Based on the students' quantitative responses to the course valuation and key views from free text responses. Quantitative summary and any graphs are attached.)

The students' evaluations were in general more mixed than in previous years. Some of the students reported that they found the labs somewhat disconnected from the lectures. The students appeared to appreciate that the assignment and journal club articles were handed out early in the course.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course covered the basic statistical methods that the students will meet in other parts of the program. As with last year, the repeated use of a precision medicine course data set for students to work on throughout, in labs and the assignment, works well. The teachers feel that there is a good balance of lectures, computer labs, self-study.

Weaknesses of the course:

In previous years the teachers have felt that there is little time for the students to reflect on/absorb the material and that, except for the lab sessions, there is little time for feedback to the students. Despite extending the course over a longer time period (without changing the course content or course hours) the problem of insufficient time to reflect on the material has not been resolved, and in fact, this year, was clearly even more of a problem than in previous years. In the course council the students mentioned that part of the problem was that they were working with the course running in parallel. This year there was a low attendance at the computer labs, in comparison with previous years, and significantly less interaction between students and staff.

3. Other views

Although difficult to confirm, the apparent (increased) use of generative AI by the students in the labs (and in self-study), compared to previous years, has possibly had a negative influence on the students' learning, for example via a marked reduction in interaction between students and staff available at labs.

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

(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)

Given that the labs worked less well than in previous years, we will next year be more consequent in terms of insuring that the labs are more teacher-led. For some sessions we will consider breaking lectures into smaller components and interspersing them with shorter lab sessions to help students connect the theory to practice. Although we tried to reduce the difficulty of coding in the assignment by pointing to code used in the labs, there is a need to go even further with this. Compared to previous years, the journal club worked better in terms of the opportunity for students to discuss papers with the teaching staff during the preparation of their presentations. We will though try to extend/formalise this even more next year. We will also extend the course over a longer period and jointly plan the timing of classes/self-study session with the course running in parallel, using what we have learnt this year.

Appendices: