



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4B1116	Course title Applied Biomedical Communication and Professional Development	Credits 7.5 HP
Semester (VT/HT-yr) VT2024	Dates Feb 17th 2024 to March 21st 2024	

Course Director Matthew Kirkham (MK)	Examiner Lena Ström
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course <i>Main teachers: Scientific writing in biomedical research, 4.5 hp:</i> - Terese Bergfors <i>Main teachers: Personal Development and Applied Biomedical Communication, 3.0 hp</i> - Ana Oliveira - Natalie Jellinek - Peter Lind	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students at the 3-week check: 53	Number passed at final course day: 47	Response frequency course valuation survey: 59%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) - Course council meet with course representatives- Held after the course is completed - Through continues discussions between course representatives and the course director during the course - Through Informal discussions between students and course director during the course		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students Course analysis is uploaded on to course website. Emailed to the course representatives Discussed in the Roll Call lecture		

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: Sept 1st 2024
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: Sept 1st 2024

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

- Moved the order of teaching moments regarding the scientific writing component. This year the students had results writing, and graphic abstract before the workshop on writing the discussion and hedge words. Students last year felt this would be a move logical order.
- Changed the culture awareness workshop to reduce the amount of repetition in relation to the to the introduction week of the global master program.
- Added workshop on global health and SDGs to increase student awareness on how these topics relate to biomedicine research.

- Moved the personal development assignments into the 'classroom'. Allocated the last 30mins of the relevant campus sessions to complete these assignments.
- To complete the write assignments students must develop a simple research study passed on previous scientific text. To help the students with this at the beginning of the course more focus was placed on experimental design /study design in the introductory workshop.
- More clear instructions on the deadlines and how they related to different course moments.
- Included better examples of good and bad graphic abstracts on the course canvas pages.
- Addition workshops on AI and who to it could be used responsibly.

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.)

-Additional from discussion with the student representatives

Summary of students' student online survey

In general, 72% of the students thought the course was very good or good. The survey also demonstrated that the students felt that they had developed valuable expertise /skills during the course (mean score of 3.7 out of 5) and that the feedback the students received was important for their development and learning (mean score 4.1 out of 5). Furthermore, most of the students felt to a large extent or very large extent that the course structure was good (mean score 3.8 out of 5), the workload was reasonable (mean score 3.6 out of 5) and examination was relevant (mean score 4.2 out of 5).

Summary of responses for student online survey on improvements

Strengths of the course mentioned by the participants:

- Good chance to work on professional communication.
- Opportunity to work in different groups.
- Variety in structure between lectures, seminars, and self-study.
- Learning how to use Affinity Designer for figure design.
- Assignment of creating a digital abstract.
- Guidance provided by the course leader.
- Learning scientific writing skills.
- Emphasis on cooperation and group work.
- Feedback from classmates and teachers.
- Development of creativity.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Provide more facts on global health in the sessions.
- Streamline and clarify assignment deadlines.
- Reduce the number of small assignments for peer review.
- Make cultural awareness workshops more engaging and relevant.
- Restructure the scientific writing assignments to include actual data/results.
- Provide more time between abstract and results writing.
- Limit the workload and make it more relaxed.

- Provide clearer instructions and more time for project planning.
- Provide more self-study time.

Most relevant feedback from Student reps

- In general the course was well received and most students gained valuable skills for their future career.
- Moving the personal development assignments into the classroom worked well. One suggestion is to change the order a little, especially the group contract would be better suited to accompany the final group assignment.
- The new global health/SDG workshop was good, but in combination with the pre existing content there was repetition elements that could be removed.
- In general, the course has a lot of peer-to-peer feedback and in most cases this worked well. But there were some students who they felt the peer feedback they received was poor.
- Student felt very stressed at the beginning of the course, especially at the number of weekly deadlines. The student reps felt that it could be made clearer that in most of the case the text that need to be submitted was a draft and did not need to be prefect. This was particularly relevant with the scientific text. The student reps felt it could be more clearly state that quantity and quality of the science/data was second to the writing style when it came to assessments. They felt that a better explained could reduce student stress.
- The most stressful deadlines that should be look at.
 - Abstract for the scientific text. Students felt they needed more time or more help deciding what they wanted to write on before they could start writing the abstract,
 - Graphic abstract. The deadline was very close to when the first workshop related to graphic design was.

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

Strengths of the course (what worked well)

- The much better structure in the canvas course help more of the students understand the deadlines.
- Students like the flow of task much better this year.
- The students appreciate the practical tips and workshops on writing and graphic design.
- The students also really appreciated the career awareness and personal development part of the course that gives them a better perspective on career paths and their own professional development.
- Most students felt that they gained value skills from the course.

Weaknesses of the course (what could be improved)

- There was still some confusion about deadlines though this was greatly improved from the previous year.
- Still the balance of how much and when to give peer to peer feedback can be improved.
- The structure and integration of the global health and the internalization could be improved.
- The students struggled at the beginning of the course to come up with the subject that that there were going to write on.

3. Other views

- There was a lot of advice and feedback given during on-campus activities. Though these sessions were generally well attended, it is noticeable that 30% of the students only appeared for mandatory activities.
- There was also a large drop of campus attendance as the course progressed.

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.)

Possible areas to improve:

- Global health and SDGs: Remove the repetitive elements and align more with previous courses. Try and make content more relevant to biomedical research and biomedical students. For example: How can biomedical students contribute to SDGs at KI?
- As suggested, move the group contract to the final group assignment in the course.
- Increase student information or awareness in the beginning of the course
 - the benefits of peer-to-peer feedback and specifically the benefit to the giver of the feedback.
 - Deadlines and which are the final submissions, and which are for draft text.
 - Move examples or more help for the students to choose the topics that they want to write on. Especially regarding the abstract submitted in the first week, repeat a lot that this is a draft and not the final graded submission.
- Spread out the graphic abstract workshops with self-study time and move the deadline to a little later to reduce student stress over the submission.
- More focus in the introduction to scientific writing workshop on what is a good research question and how this relates to experimental/study design. The aim is to help students decide on what they want to write about. Also investigate if AI could help in brainstorming ideas.
- Add more on why it is good to not write about real data. This gives the student freedom and flexibility to focus on the writing process.
- Improve the AI workshops. Focus on the ethical aspects followed by the specific examples of how it could be used.

Appendices: