Karolinska Institutet

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4TX038	Risk Assessment and In Silico Toxicology	8.5
Semester (VT/HT-year) HT 24		

Course leader/examiner	Other teacher(s) responsible for major part(s) (if applicable)
Magnus Olsson	Pernilla strid (Department of Clinical Neuroscience) Annika Hanberg Anna Beronius Linda Schenk Carolina Vogs (Department of Animal Biosciences)

Number of registered students (at 3-week check)	Number of students that passed at end of course (after regular session)	Response rate in KI survey (%)
12	12	100
Other methods for influence by students (besides KI survey) No		
How and when is feedback of KI survey results given to students? The KI-survey was published in Canvas two weeks after the end of the course.		

1. **Description of any changes made since last course event (based on for example feedback from previous students)**

-The career workshop previously covering two days was reduced to one day.
-The journal club "Regulatory Risk assessment in EU" was shortened to 6, instead of 7 days.
-A new three-day module in Toxicokinetic modelling was designed and introduced into the course.

2. **Brief summary of the KI survey**

(Based on students' quantitative answers and major feedback from free-text answers)
Overall good responses from students for all parts of the course and no major criticisms. Some minor suggestions for improvements were provided in student responses, mainly with respect to scope of individual modules.

KI or programme-specific question	Average result -(1-worst, 5-best)
In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	4.8
In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.7
In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.6
In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	4.8
In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.8
The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.5
The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.4
I was actively participating in learning activities.	4.8
When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	4.8

What is your overall experience of the course?	**4.8**
To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the course/number of credits awarded? *(1= far too little, 2= to little, 3= appropriate, 4= too much, 5= far too much)*	**3**

3. Course coordinator's reflections on the course and the results:

Appreciatively, overall good responses from students for all parts of the course. Based on the course evaluation, it is evident that all teachers involved maintained a high educational standard. Also, that they were open to ideas and opinions about the course's content and promoted a scientific way of thinking.

4. Other comments:

Quite a few comments from students indicated that they believe that the SciRAP module would fit better in the "applications and methods in tox research" course before starting to write the lab report.

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

Based on the course evaluations there is no need for major course changes, especially since 2006 will be the last time the course is given in its current format before the transition to a new programme curriculum in 2026.