Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
1BI039	Chemical Biology	8hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT24	**Period** April 25 – June 2, 2024	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Bernhard Lohkamp	**Bernhard Lohkamp**
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers** various

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
54	**39**	**64.0%**

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Course committee meetings, one after two weeks and one after the exam.

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Survey (without comments) published on the kursweb page (Drupal). Survey sent to students who have participated in the survey (via Canvas). Discussed survey with the course committee. Changes etc will be presented at the start of the new course.

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: **23/08/24**
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 23/08/24

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

Both lab manuals have been revised and clarified. The wet lab task has been slightly modified to work more reliably. A written statement on the use of AI was introduced for the written work incl. a reflection on changes if it has been used.
A new seminar on structural biology analysis & methods has been added and the seminars were intended to be a group work followed by a group presentation on the covered tasks.
The project work presentations were split into two, to allow for more presentation time and discussion.
The time for the final exam was extended.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations 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 are overall satisfied with the course from learning new, interesting information to the corresponding examination and achieved the intended learning outcomes. However, some feel thought that the exam was still too comprehensive and long, the computer lab too difficult and overall too much content described. However, the underlying thread in the course which holds the different parts together is visible

(again) but not necessarily for all students. The computer lab was perceived as interesting and fun by some and demanding and difficult and long by others. The group, project work was overall well received. The lab manuals appear still to require some more clarification. Students would appreciate more specific and fewer reading instructions/source since there is no text book available as such.

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

Strengths of the course:

Teaching staff, topic, and content as such is very much appreciated by the students. The computer lab incl. introduction of Chimera appears well liked and teaches the students a lot. The project work focused at the end of the course allows students to apply the gained knowledge in their own work and is separated from the exam. The given seminars are appreciated by the students. The course integrates several topics learned in previous courses and offers real research laboratory sessions.

Weaknesses of the course:

The lab reports were challenging and required more time than expected and scheduled for a number of students. Some instructions in the lab manual need clarification and/or be extended. The computer lab was very challenging and time consuming for some students. The exam was experienced by some as too extensive (however results were comparable to previous years) and the overall content of the course too much. Lab report assessment was often lacking feedback. Some scheduling could be improved, e.g. the deadline for the wet lab report was deemed close to the exam. Lack of limited and defined course literature.

3. Other views

Klicka här för att ange text.

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

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

The lab compendia will be revised further in different ways. The wet lab manual requires some updates based on the experiences this year (BLo, HAx). The lecture on assays will be extended to include more lab relevant content (incl. data analysis) and/or a data analysis seminar will be introduced. The wet lab report will be simplified e.g. the introduction omitted. The computer lab incl. manual will be restructured to increase the flow and include a Chimera introduction in connection with a quiz using a "simpler" model protein (BLo, MEk). The new revision of a recommended text books will be evaluated to see if the course content can be more defined and clearer aims be formulated (BLo, P. Arvidsson, M. Haraldsson). In this context some reduction in content and/or detail will be considered (BLo). The exam will be given some more time and if possible the lab report deadlines moved further away from the exam. Offer time, teacher and place for groups to meet directly after the project work introduction lecture.

Appendices:

Survey