Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title		Credits
4FF012	Omics in science		3,5 HP
Semester	**Period**		
HT24	**2024-10-24 to 2024-11-08**		

Course coordinator	Examiner
Stefan Reitzner	Jessica Norrbom
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers**
	Niels Krämer, Kirstin McGregor, Björn Forsberg, William Hangasjärvi, Tina Gorsek, Antonio Checa, Jaromir Mikes, Adil Mardinoglu

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
10	**10**	60%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Email contact with the course coordinator		
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: 2024-12-04

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

Compared to last semester, the course was fine-tuned with some changes in lecturers (transcriptomics; practical sessions). After the first time for this course last semester, some instructions have been updated to be more specific and the practical tutorial material improved.

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

The course metrics are even better than in last years occasion in almost all questions: Students stated that during the course they learned valuable skulls (mean: 4,7), they reached intended learning outcome (4,5), and there was a common theme (4,5). Scientific thinking and openness to ideas and course structure were rated 4,8, 4,7 and 4,8 respectively. The psychosocial environment was rated 5,0. The question with the lowest rating was about

previous knowledge, which was rated 3, which is reasonable given that there are not a lot of opportunities in bioinformatics for students in this program.. However, the students found the course appropriately challenging (3,8). The written evaluations are very positive, the students like the structure of the course, especially the coding part. "I think the omics course was the best course I ever had during my TPP master's at KI". On the improvement side, students would prefer this course to be even longer, or earlier during the program because they would have liked to do one of their projects together with some of the lecturers (which at the time of the course it was already too late for). The information about the exam was mentioned to have potential for improvement.

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

Strengths of the course: **Diverse selection of teachers with theoretical and proactical aspects. Lots of variations and less monotonous than other concepts. That the students were asking for this course to be even longer does speak for itself too, it seems like it covers a highly requested need for more courses covering coding exercises. The wide variety of lecturers for the theoretical aspects also gave us a higher chance of having lectures that the students precieved as excellent.**

Weaknesses of the course: **The unknown diverse previous knowledge of the students about coding/R usage or computer analysis in general. Also the personal hardware of the students that can create an uncertainty about which software will be able to be run on their machines. The course also requires the active participation of students, depending on their motivation, the course can be a success or not (worked out very well in this occasion).**

4. Other views

nothing to note

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

We will try to make the exam information more clear and refine the questions to be more relevant. Apart from that I think that the course turned out very well and doesn't need too much adjustments.

Appendices:

Course evaluation long form.