Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4FF003	**Project work in translational physiology and pharmacology**	**7,5**
Semester	**Period**	
VT25	**2025-05-05 - 2025-06-05**	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Stefano Gastaldello	Jessica Norrbom
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**
Paulo Jannig, Emanuela Santini, Mattias Carlström, Gianluigi Pironti, Nikolaos Lazarinis, James Tribble, Phillip Newton, Stefanie Prast-Nielsen, Roberto Gatti, Eddie Weitzberg, Stefano Gastaldello	**Alex Bersellini Farinotti**

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
43	**42**	72% (31 of 43)

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Course council with the course coordinator and student representatives to obtain feedback from the students.

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
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: 200115
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 200115

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

In response to student feedback from last year's course evaluation, the Journal Club session has been made a mandatory component this year. Additionally, one extra week has been allocated to a laboratory activity to enhance practical engagement compared to the previous course offering.

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

1. Learning Outcomes and Skill Development:

• A strong majority felt they developed valuable skills, with 68% stating this to a large or very large extent.
• 84% felt they achieved the intended learning outcomes to a large or very large extent.
• Students generally agreed the course promoted scientific thinking, including critical and analytical reasoning (mean score: 4.1/5).
2. Course Structure and Teaching Quality:
• Students appreciated a clear thematic structure and integration between learning outcomes and assessments (mean: 3.8/5).
• Teachers were seen as very open to feedback, with over 93% rating this positively.
• The balance between lectures/labs and assignment time was praised (mean: 4.5/5).
• Laboratory sessions and follow-up seminars were regarded as highly relevant to learning (mean: 4.3/5).
3. Environment and Course Experience:
• The psychosocial environment was rated very highly (mean: 4.6/5), with no reports of stress, discrimination, or competition being common.
• The course was seen as well-structured, supportive, and less stressful compared to previous courses.
4. Challenges and Prior Knowledge:
• Students generally felt well-prepared (mean: 3.8/5), but found the course moderately challenging (mean: 3.0/5).
5. Highlights Noted by Students:
• Laboratory work was consistently identified as the most valuable and enjoyable component.
• The instructor's supportive and enthusiastic approach was widely appreciated.
• Students liked the innovation of tailored presentations for different audiences.
• Clear deadline communication helped reduce stress.

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

Strengths of the course: **The course received highly positive feedback from students for its well-rounded and supportive structure. A key strength was the teaching, especially the course coordinator, who was praised for his approachability, encouragement, and ability to create a relaxed and motivating learning environment. His dedication helped students feel confident and safe to engage, ask questions, and learn from mistakes.**
The laboratory component was another major highlight. Students valued the hands-on experience with techniques like PCR and cell culture, and appreciated the time given for experimentation and reflection. The labs promoted teamwork, critical thinking, and practical understanding of data analysis and methodology.
Students also felt the course was well-organized, with balanced workload and clear deadlines, allowing them to manage tasks without unnecessary stress. The absence of a final written exam was welcomed, as the focus on assignments and presentations better supported learning.
The final presentation assignment, tailored for various target audiences, was seen as innovative and relevant for future careers. It enhanced students' communication skills and added real-world value.

Lastly, the psychosocial environment was considered excellent, marked by respect, support, and low competition. Overall, students regarded the course as engaging, professionally valuable, and one of the best in their program.

Weaknesses of the course: **Based on the full course evaluation, the main weaknesses of the course centered around the lecture content and journal club format. Some students felt that lectures were repetitive, overlapping with previous courses, and lacked novelty or advanced content and they suggested replacing or supplementing lectures with more clinical or translational topics. The online journal club discussions on Canvas were frequently criticized for being less engaging and lacking real-time interaction; many students preferred in-person group discussions. Some also noted that assignment deadlines were too clustered at the end of the course, making workload management harder. A few students found instructions on Canvas unclear, especially for assignments. Others felt that group topic assignments were too rigid, limiting student interest. Lastly, some commented that lectures were too long and detailed, which reduced motivation in the absence of formal assessment.**

4. Other views

In addition to praise and constructive criticism, students offered various thoughtful suggestions. Some appreciated the flexibility to submit presentations online when sick and the clear deadline communication. There was a call for more novelty in lectures, such as introducing new organs or translational themes and greater student choice in topics for assignments or presentations. A few students recommended adding short quizzes or interactive elements to enhance lecture engagement. Despite critiques, several emphasized they would highly recommend the course and described it as a refreshing and motivating experience compared to earlier modules.

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

This course represents a deliberate revision based on feedback received from last year's student evaluations. One significant modification was the implementation of a mandatory Journal Club, assigned through the Canvas platform. This adjustment was designed to facilitate student interaction in a more flexible manner, allowing engagement without requiring in-person attendance. As the course coordinator, I will further refine the timeline and enhance the organization of both the schedule and the range of topics covered, to optimize the learning experience.

Overall, I highly appreciate the positive student evaluations, which reflect the collective dedication, effort, and active engagement of myself and the instructional team. This feedback not only validates our current approach but also motivates a continued and robust commitment to elevating the quality of the course, ensuring it meets the highest educational standards.

Appendices:

Student evaluation