Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4FF005	**Applied physiology and pharmacology- research project 1**	**7,5**
Semester	**Period**	
HT24	**2411111 - 241215**	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Funda Orhan	Duarte Ferreira
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**
Funda Orhan	**Jessica Norrbom, Vitaly Kaminsky, Gianluigi Pironti, Tomas Schiffer, Sonia Youhanna, Elena Kochetkova, Ana Teixeira.**

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
32		43,75%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Coursecouncil		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students		

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: 20250306

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

Based on feedback from the previous course occasion, a change was made to the 'How is it going?' assignment. Previously, this was conducted live via Zoom, but for the 2024 course, it was moved to Canvas to provide greater flexibility for students to reflect and submit their thoughts at their convenience.

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

According to the results of the 2024 course evaluation (see attachment), the course received generally positive feedback from the students who participated in the survey. The majority of respondents reported that they had developed valuable expertise and skills through the course (mean 3.9). Similarly, most students agreed that they successfully achieved the intended

learning outcomes (mean 4.3), and a high proportion recognized a clear thematic connection throughout the course, from learning outcomes to examinations (mean 4.4).

In addition, the course was successful in promoting scientific thinking and reasoning, such as analytical and critical thinking, with a mean score of 4.2. Teachers were perceived as open to feedback regarding the course's structure and content (mean 3.9). However, 35.7% of students believed that these aspects could be further improved. The psychosocial environment of the course was rated highly (mean 4.3), though there were minor concerns regarding competition among students (mean 2.3).

Approximately 57% of respondents appreciated the opportunity to carry out a short research or developmental project within their master's program to a large or very large extent (mean 3.7). However, several comments highlighted that the five-week project duration was considered too short for meaningful results. Suggestions included combining this course with the subsequent project to provide more comprehensive learning and development opportunities.

Several areas for improvement were identified through student feedback. These included clearer communication of course deadlines and expectations, particularly concerning the "How's it going?" assignment. Students also expressed a desire for more detailed and standardized feedback from teachers to improve the learning experience.

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

Strengths of the course:

- The course provided students with the unique opportunity to collaborate with world-leading experts in physiology and pharmacology, gaining invaluable research experience within a condensed timeframe.

- Students were able to explore new methodologies and innovative approaches in translational physiology and pharmacology, enhancing their technical and analytical skills.

- The written report component was widely regarded as a meaningful and beneficial exercise, allowing students to practice effective scientific communication.

Weaknesses of the course:

- The short duration of the project (5 weeks) posed challenges for some students, particularly in securing suitable placements within labs, companies, or public authorities that could accommodate the limited timeframe.

4. Other views

For the 2024 course evaluation, only 43.75% of students completed the survey, which again limited the ability to gather comprehensive feedback. Some students raised concerns about the 'How's it going?' assignment, stating that its purpose and implementation could be improved. Specifically, the peer-review component for self-reflection felt unnecessary to some,

with suggestions to instead provide opportunities for peer review of the final report or presentation.

In addition, students highlighted that the short project duration (5 weeks) remained a challenge, and some reiterated the idea of combining this course with a follow-up project to allow for a more in-depth learning experience. These insights highlight areas where the course structure could be revisited to enhance its effectiveness and address students' needs.

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

The course continued to be successful in 2024, with students finding suitable labs or companies to complete their projects despite the short duration. Communication between the course coordinator and students, primarily via email, remained effective.

The transition of the mandatory Zoom seminar to Canvas was implemented this year, allowing students greater flexibility to complete the checkpoint at their convenience. While this change was generally well-received, some students suggested further refining the assignment's structure to make its purpose clearer and more impactful.

Appendices: