

## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 4BI107	<b>Course title</b> Frontiers in Biomedicine	<b>Credits</b> 10.5
<b>Semester (VT/HT-yr)</b> HT23 (autumn 2023)	<b>Dates</b> 28 <sup>th</sup> August – 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2023	

<b>Course Director</b> Rachel Fisher	<b>Examiner</b> Rachel Fisher
<b>Teachers in charge of different parts of the course</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circulation, Metabolism and Endocrinology: Jurga Laurencikiene + Ljubica Matic</li> <li>• Cell Biology, Development and Regeneration: Karolina Kublickiene + Lena Ström</li> <li>• Immunology and Infection: Benedict Chambers</li> <li>• Neuroscience: Fredrik Piehl, Maria Ankarcrona + Lennart Brodin</li> <li>• Tumour Biology: Margareta Wilhelm</li> <li>• Course Administrator: Mari Liljefors</li> </ul>	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Within each “track” there were a number of different teachers with expertise in the different topics that were covered.  In addition, the course contained a “generic track” with three focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic writing: Jenny Siméus</li> <li>• Rhetoric: Peter Lind</li> <li>• Ethics: Henrik Ahlenius</li> </ul>

<b>Number of registered students at the 3-week check</b> 54	<b>Number passed at final course day</b> 43 (11 students were required to submit revisions of an assignment)	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 88.9%
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) A course council, open to all students, was held close to the end of the course. The meeting was held in Zoom and approx. 30 students participated. Minutes were taken (by a student representative) and placed on Canvas. Rachel Fisher, Jurga Laurencikiene, Mari Liljefors attended. During the course, students were encouraged to give feedback directly to the course director or track leaders. It was also possible to post feedback on Canvas. Contact with the course administrator was encouraged.		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students</b> 2023-10-10 (survey placed on courses webpages in both Canvas and Drupal)		

### 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: 2024-03-01  
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2024-03-01

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

- The introductions to the programme and to the Frontiers in Biomedicine course were modified to reduced repetition, optimise the use of time and clarify the organisation, goals, and expectations of the course.
- The introduction to each track was revised to provide a clearer presentation of the organisation, goals, and expectations of the specific track.



- The order of the components of the generic track was reorganised to provide a more logical flow (the workshop on using sources and paraphrasing was placed first). Activities to increase student interaction during the workshops were introduced.
- The organisation of the journal club in Canvas was standardised across the tracks, and journal club articles were updated.
- The organisation of the "tasks" (assignments) in Canvas was standardised across the tracks and all student texts were submitted to Ourginal (Urkund). Tasks were updated and modified (taking into account student feedback from previous year). Grading was reviewed to strengthen continuity across the course. Guidelines for the use of generative AI were discussed and clarified.
- The organisation of the research project fair was improved so that students could prepare better beforehand and find projects/researchers/topics more easily.

## **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.)*

In general, the students were satisfied with the course and appreciated the design that provided a good introduction to KI, the programme and to one another. Although the course was considered to be challenging, this was generally viewed in a positive light and the course was deemed to be rewarding. However, the design of the course and the multiple assignments was found stressful at times. The course was viewed to have promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning.

- Positive comments: Most respondents praised the course for being interesting, relevant, well-structured, and well-taught. They appreciated the diversity of topics, the quality of lectures and seminars, the feedback from the teachers, and the opportunities for learning new skills and methods.
- Negative comments: Some respondents criticised the course for being too demanding, too fast-paced, or too broad. They suggested that the course could be more focused, more interactive, or more flexible. They also mentioned some technical issues with Canvas, a lack of clarity regarding some assignments, and the difficulty of some examinations/assignments.
- Suggestions for improvement: Some respondents suggested providing more examples, more guidance, more feedback, or more time for assignments and exams. They also requested more communication with the teachers, more collaboration with other students, and more resources for further learning.

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

### ***Strengths of the course:***

- A broad introduction to research and researchers at KI, achieved through lectures, journal clubs, tasks/assignments and research project fair
- Research project fair providing opportunities for students and researchers to come in to contact with one another and for the students to find potential labs in which to perform their research projects (beneficial for students and researchers alike)
- Generic track providing training in scientific writing, ethics and rhetoric
- Multiple opportunities to give oral presentations and to learn from this (combined with the rhetoric part of the generic track)
- Group work providing multiple opportunities for students to get to know one another (important since the first course in the programme)
- A range of different assignments



- A course that was challenging, but rewarding
- An emphasis on critical thinking and analysis
- Excellent track organisers + engaged and enthusiastic teachers
- Structured organisation of the course web on Canvas providing access to information and course material, combined with excellent course administration

***Weaknesses of the course:***

- The introductions to the course as a whole and to the component tracks need to be improved to provide the students with the relevant information at the right time, and provide clarity regarding design/organisation/expectations
- Too intensive at times with short deadlines
- The challenge of grading group assignments and the corresponding assessment criteria
- Designing “tasks”/assignments (home examinations) in relation to the use of generative AI
- Uneven “depth” in different tracks: “state-of-the-art” generally appreciated, but some parts were felt to be too basic/general
- Heavy administrative burden of organising the research project fairs

**3. Other views**

Generally, the course ran well. Students and teachers enjoyed the format, which allowed for extensive interaction and discussion. Teachers were impressed by the performance of the students. The course promotes critical thinking and analysis, as well as providing an introduction to KI and the Master’s Programme in Biomedicine.

**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.)*

- Continue to refine the introduction to the course clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc.  
Responsible = Course Director  
Implement in the first two days of the course in HT24
- Continue to improve the introduction to each of the tracks to clarify the organisation, goals, expectations etc  
Responsible = Track leaders  
Implement at the start of each track block in HT24
- Review grading within the course and across the tracks. Discuss with track leaders to ensure similar assessment procedures, marking, grading etc. Revise assessment criteria as required.  
Responsible = Course Director/track leaders  
Implement discussion and review of practices prior to start of course in HT24
- Update the content of the bioethics workshop and increase discussion and activities to promote student participation.  
Responsible = Course Director/bioethics teacher  
Implement HT24
- Develop discussion around the use of generative AI and how it should (or should not) be used.  
Responsible = Course Director/Track leaders/academic writing teacher  
Implement HT24



**Karolinska  
Institutet**

- Move the research project fairs to events organised under the control of the Biomedicine Programme Committee. The fairs will no longer be part of the Frontiers in Biomedicine course (and will not be held during the course), thereby freeing time for students to complete their assignments.  
Responsible = Course Director/Biomedicine Programme Committee  
Implement HT24

**Appendices:**

Course survey HT23