Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF012	Course title Omics in science - bioinformatic analysis and visualization of gene regulation	Credits 3,5
Semester HT25	Period 251023-251107	

Course coordinator Stefan Reitzner	Examiner Jessica Norrbom
Teacher in charge of component Stefan Reitzner	Other participating teachers Kirstin MacGregor, Niels Krämer, William Hangasjärvi, Aron Arzoomand, Tina Gorsek, Antonio Checa, Jaromir Mikes, Havva Ozlem Altay

Number of registered students during the three week check 29	Number approved on the last course date 29	Response frequency course valuation survey 41.38 %
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course council, continuous student feedback during the course		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students **Publishing of evaluation results on course homepage.**		

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: 20260127

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

The course was scaled up (from 12 to 29) due to high demand, which required teachers to be added. Some guest lecturers were replaceed. Due to time constraints of external guest lecturers, the order of the lectures had to be changed (and was maybe not ideal).

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

The numeric evaluation of the course was excellent, with all marks being between 5 and 6 on the 1-6 scale. In the written comments students, like last year, ask for the course to be longer and to spend more time with coding. Students also wrote about the schedule itself, and asked about some scheduling choices and the order of lectures. For example they mentioned that the last lecture is on Wednesday (last week) with the exam on Friday, which is a short distance.

They also asked about the software versions used in the course and why they can't use more up to date Rstudio versions.

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

Strengths of the course: **The course is very interactive, students like the figure presentation evaualtion part. There is a good mix between theory and practise. That the students mention smaller details in the improvement suggestions also tells me that the general course concept works well and is liked by the students. Also that some write they are replacing excel with R as their go-to data program.**

Weaknesses of the course: **The course depends heavily on the students skills, some years the same thing is too easy while other years it is too hard. It also depends on the students own hardware working with the software, which can be very unpredictable (that is also why we use a "conservative", older version of the software, so it works on as many as possible devices). It also depends on external lecturers which can make the course feel a bit less "integrated" because they usually just present their own content with less coordination with other lecturers than internal teachers.**

4. Other views

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

For next year I will make the following adjustments:

1. update the software versions used in the course (requires compatibility testing)

2. give more space in the schedule between the last lecture and the exam

3. write a short synopsis of all lectures and the logic of the order of them for all lecturers to see so they can know what the students already heard about

4. Schedule a lecture on the last week Monday morning and instead giving the afternoon to figure preparation as well (split up the figure preparation day), so lectures can come earlier

5. Re-sort the lecture order and be more strict about it with teachers (this year there were a lot of calendar conflicts that required re-scheduling).

Appendices: