Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
5BD000	Biostatistics 1: Introduction to biostatistics	7.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr)	**Dates**	
HT24	November 4 2024 - January 19 2025	

Course Director	Examiner
Therese Andersson	Therese Andersson
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course	**Other participating teachers**
Therese Andersson	Paul Dickman
	Adina Feldman
	Alexander Ploner
	Cecilia Radkiewicz
	Samuel Rhedin
	Sarah Bergen
	Thorgerdur Palsdottir
	Anna Mia Eborn Martinovic
	Camilla Wahlbeck
	Mattias Vesterlund

Number of registered students at the 3-week check	Number passed at final course day	Response frequency course valuation survey
37	36	23 (62%)

Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey)
Course council was scheduled during lecture time in the middle of the course and was open to all students
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students
The course evaluation and course analysis will be reported to the students through the course web and Canvas

Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also to the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 2025-02-05
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2025-02-05

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

N/A - This was the first time the course was given

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

(Based on the students' quantitative responses to the course valuation and key views from free text responses. Quantitative summary and any graphs are attached.)

The evaluation was in general positive. On the question "What is your overall opinion of the course" 12 responded very good, 10 responded good and 1 responded ok, giving a mean of 4.5 and median of 5.0. Other aspects with a high score were for example "the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning" and "the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content" and the examination. The questions that got a lower score were "I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course" and "The course built upon my knowledge from previous courses in the programme" that both got a mean of 3.9.

Based on the free text answers, the students very much appreciated that the course included lectures from experts with different competences. Other positive aspects were the timing of assignments throughout the course and enough time to work on the assignments as well as an open and encouraging learning environment. The students also pointed out several aspects for improvement including the need for more reading material and assessment or quizzes on some of the topics. Another point raised by several students was that the groups should be smaller for the group assignments.

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

Strengths of the course:
The layout of the course was good, with the three major themes of how to analyse data for different types of research questions, along with lectures on other topics to cover all the intended learning outcomes. To include several teachers to teach within their own expertise area was very appreciated and a strength of the course. The examination in the form of assignments went well and were an important part of promoting a scientific way of thinking and reasoning.

Weaknesses of the course:
There was not enough extra reading material for the students to prepare before lectures or to learn more and deepen their knowledge beyond the lecture material. Formative assessment, for example in the form of quizzes, would be useful.

3. Other views

Some students pointed out that 4-hour time slots for face-to-face learning activities was too much, however it is difficult to know if the majority of students would have preferred shorter time slots spread over several days instead.

One group assignment was to present some ethical and legal aspects concerning the use of personal data in biomedical research. The format of oral group presentations seem to have been appreciated by some students (mentioned as positive in the course evaluation) but not liked by others (mentioned as something that can be improved in the course evaluation).

4. Course Director's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)
There will be no major changes made for next year, since the evaluation was generally positive, and the teachers have also been very positive. However, small improvements will be made to all material, and the course director will discuss and give feedback to the content of the lectures with each lecturer separately. Other changes to be made is to be clearer with the intended learning outcomes, and remind the students about them throughout the course, to make the course structure more

clear. The groups for the assignments will be smaller, even though this means a heavy workload on the main teacher. The assessment criteria for the assignments will be revised, to make it more transparent for the students how the assignments are graded. Lastly, the students will be given more reading material and quizzes during the course, this will be prepared by the course director and the other teachers in collaboration.

Appendices: