# Course analysis (course evaluation)

| Course code | Course title | Credits |
|---|---|---|
| 4FF006 | **Applies physiology and pharmacology- research project 2 HT 23** | **7.5** |
| **Semester** | **Period** | |
| **HT24** | **December 16 - January 19** | |

| Course coordinator | Examiner |
|---|---|
| **Funda Orhan** | Duarte Ferreira |
| **Teacher in charge of component** | **Other participating teachers** |
| **Funda Orhan** | **Patrik Fridh, 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 | **32** | 50% |
| **Other methods for student influence** (in addition to concluding course valuation)<br>Course council | | |
| **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**

In HT24, a key change was the transition from digital poster presentations (via screen) to printed posters. This allowed students to engage in a more interactive and traditional poster session, similar to scientific conferences. The new format provided more opportunities for discussions and peer feedback, enhancing the learning experience.

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

The course evaluation was completed by 50% of students, who generally rated the course positively. The majority of respondents reported that they had developed valuable expertise and skills (mean 4.3) and successfully achieved all intended learning outcomes (mean 4.7). In addition, students recognized a strong thematic connection throughout the course, from learning objectives to examinations (mean 4.5).

The course was effective in promoting scientific thinking, including analytical and critical reasoning (mean 4.2). Teachers were perceived as open to feedback regarding the course's structure and content (mean 4.2). The psychosocial environment was rated highly (mean 4.3), and there were no significant concerns about competition among students (mean 1.9).

Approximately 81% of respondents valued the opportunity to carry out a short research or developmental project within the master's program (mean 4.1). However, some students found the five-week project duration limiting, especially due to the overlap with the Christmas holidays.

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

***Strengths of the course:*** **The course provided students with valuable research experience and practical laboratory training before their thesis work. The transition to a printed poster session was well received, as it allowed for a more interactive and engaging scientific discussion, mimicking a real conference setting. In addition, the peer-review process before the final poster submission was considered beneficial for student learning.**
**Many students appreciated the opportunity to work independently on a project of their choice, fostering critical thinking and scientific reasoning. The possibility of conducting short research projects throughout the program was also seen as a strength, enabling students to explore different research methods and lab environments.**

***Weaknesses of the course:*** **The main challenge of the course was its timing, as it overlapped with the Christmas holidays. Students found it difficult to coordinate with their supervisors and complete their projects due to lab closures and limited access to resources. In addition, the five-week duration was perceived as too short for meaningful research, particularly for those conducting their projects outside KI.**

**4. Other views**

**The course evaluation had a 50% response rate, an improvement from the previous year. However, the overlap with the Christmas holidays remained a major concern, as many students felt it impacted their ability to complete their projects effectively.**

**Some students suggested combining the two research project courses into a single 10-week course, as they believed this would allow for more in-depth research and reduce stress associated with short project timelines. In addition, a few students mentioned that they would have appreciated more guidance on poster formatting, including structuring sections and citing figures properly.**

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

**Overall, the course received positive feedback, with students appreciating the opportunity to gain hands-on research experience and present their work in a printed poster session, which**

**enhanced scientific discussions. The course successfully met its intended learning outcomes, and students reported developing valuable skills in research and scientific reasoning.**

**However, the timing of the course remains a challenge due to the overlap with the Christmas holidays, impacting project continuity and supervisor availability. The short five-week duration was also perceived as limiting, especially for students conducting research outside KI.**

**Some suggestions for improvement for next semester include:**

**- Invite a lecturer to provide guidance on designing and presenting a research poster, which could help students feel more prepared for the session.**

**Appendices:**