



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF005	Course title Research project 1	Credits 7,5
Semester HT25	Period 251110-251212	
Course coordinator Funda Orhan	Examiner Duarte Ferreira	
Teacher in charge of component Funda Orhan	Other participating teachers Jessica Norrbom, Vitaly Kaminsky, Tomas Schiffer, Sonia Youhanna, Ana Teixeira, Camille Gauthier, Haojiang Lu, Jordan Cassidy.	
Number of registered students during the three week check 44	Number approved on the last course date 41	Response frequency course valuation survey 47.73%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course council		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Course council and Canvas		

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: 2026-03-06

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

Based on experiences from the previous course occasion, the assessment criteria were revised for the current course. The grading framework was clarified and refined to better differentiate between levels of performance. This adjustment aimed to ensure a more nuanced assessment of students' work while maintaining alignment with the course objectives.

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

According to the results of the HT25 course evaluation (response rate 47.73%), the course received overall positive feedback from the participating students. A large majority of respondents agreed that the course provided strong opportunities for active learning, including independent project work and laboratory-based activities (mean 5.1). Students also reported



feeling included and respected during the course (mean 5.4), indicating a positive psychosocial learning environment.

The course was perceived as successful in encouraging students to take responsibility for their own learning (mean 5.6) and in developing problem-solving abilities (mean 5.3). Teaching was rated highly in terms of clarity and being informed by current research (both mean 5.6). Furthermore, the majority of the responding students agreed that the course structure and activities were well designed (mean 5.1).

The overall course rating was positive (mean 4.8). However, some responses reflected variation in perceptions of organisation and clarity of expectations (mean 4.3 and 5.0, respectively). Several comments highlighted time-related challenges, particularly in relation to the short duration of the project and scheduling of activities.

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

Strengths of the course:

- **The course offers students early exposure to research environments, allowing them to work independently in laboratories, companies, or other relevant settings.**
- **Students gain hands-on experience with experimental methods and data analysis, strengthening both practical and analytical skills.**
- **The written assignment was perceived as a valuable learning activity, supporting students in reflecting on their work and practicing scientific writing.**
- **Oral presentations were appreciated as an opportunity to develop communication skills and learn about peers' projects.**

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

As in previous years, approximately half of the registered students responded to the course evaluation, which limits the generalisability of the results. Nevertheless, the qualitative comments provided valuable insights.

Several students reiterated that the five-week duration was short for conducting a meaningful research project. There were also comments regarding the oral presentation day, where the



full-day format was described as demanding, with suggestions for alternative structures such as shorter sessions or dividing presentations into smaller groups.

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

The course continued to be successful in 2025, with students finding suitable laboratories or companies to complete their projects despite the short duration. Communication between the course coordinator and students, primarily via email, remained effective.

The revised grading criteria were implemented this year to improve clarity in assessment. Recurring student feedback on the limited project duration highlights an aspect that will continue to be discussed at programme level.

Appendices: