



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF003	Course title Project work in translational physiology and Pharmacology	Credits 7,5 ECTS
Semester VT24	Period 29/04 - 02/06	

Course coordinator Stefano Gastaldello	Examiner Jessica Norrbom
Teacher in charge of component	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students during the three week check 33	Number approved on the last course date 32	Response frequency course valuation survey 61,6%
--	--	--

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Via 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: 240906

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 evaluation, VT23, this year's course now includes journal clubs focused on seven specific topics and a week of practical laboratory activity, encompassing drug synthesis (aspirin) and its application to cell culture. The course structure still consists of frontal lectures, other laboratory activities, follow-up meetings, tutoring, and final exams. Additionally, in line with new KI education guidelines, we have integrated the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into some lectures, practical laboratory activities, and the oral group assignment as part of the course Intended Learning Outcomes (IOLs).

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



The course has been evaluated by 61% of the students. Lectures, lab activities and journal clubs were not mandatory. Course introduction, lab seminars, oral seminar presentations (oral group assignment) were mandatory.

Students have enjoyed the full course. From their evaluation, all questions related to the development skills, IOL outcomes, balance among time, promotion of independence analytical thinking and learning process stimulation, the distributions peaked from "to large extent" from "to a very large extent" with an average of 45%. Students felt "to a very large extent" (63%) and a "to a large extent" (31,6%) a psychological good work environment. The course has been evaluated from "to a small extent" to "to some extent" been a challenging course (75%) because of the previous students background and knowledge were sufficient from "to a large extent" to "to a very large extent" (90%).

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

Strengths of the course: The course is unique, providing students with opportunities to apply both their prior and newly acquired knowledge in various projects. These projects integrate scientific disciplines such as physiology, pharmacology, and pathology, along with communication skills and practical lab experience.

Weaknesses of the course: In accordance to the student feedback some lectures were repetitive and journal clubs were not completely structured including low attendance. For half of students the course was not challenging.

4. Other views

This year, I requested feedback from teachers regarding student participation, attendance, and interest after their lectures and journal clubs. Lecture attendance was approximately 30 to 50%, while journal club attendance ranged from 5 to 20%. In contrast, attendance for the three lab sessions was nearly 100%. Teachers commonly noted that verbal participation during lectures was quite low. Despite showing interest in the activities, few students were motivated to ask questions. I observed better engagement during the labs, and my impression aligns with my colleagues' observations: this group was quite "shy" about speaking up and actively interacting. Additionally, the group did not seem to be cohesively integrated, with some behaviors influenced by a classmate's "leader" attitude, which occasionally disrupted group cohesion. One student commented that they lacked sufficient information about the oral seminar presentation; despite a dedicated three-hour session where I was available to offer tips and feedback, only two students attended.

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

An great improvement from the previous first round has been done in VT24 and the results are clear in this report. For the next semester VT25, to improve the course and becoming more challenging for the students I will organize one extra lab activity, Journal clubs will have a clear structure, so teachers will follow the same criteria. I will communicate to the teachers to avoid repetitions and raise the lectures to an higher level. I will provide more roles for the final seminar evaluations to avoid class mate conflicts.

Appendices:

Course evaluation file.