



Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF000	Course title Integrated Physiology and Pharmacology	Credits 25
Semester HT24	Period 240902-250119	

Course coordinator Jessica Norrbom	Examiner Carl Johan Sundberg
Teacher in charge of component Gianluigi Pironti, Mikael Adner, Carl Johan Sundberg, Elisabet Stener-Victorin, Johanna Lanner, Karima Chergui, Harald Lund, Duarte Ferreira, Helin Norberg, Mattias Carlström	Other participating teachers Jessica Norrbom, Stefan Reitzner, Shane Wright, Gunnar Schulte, Karima Chergui, Kent Jardemark, Eddie Weitzberg, Tomas Schiffer, Vitaly Kaminsky, Camilla Svensson

Number of registered students during the three week check 46	Number approved on the last course date 43	Response frequency course valuation survey 52%
--	--	--

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Course and program council meetings with student representatives.

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
At course council meeting and through 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: 20250306

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

The following changes were suggested after the previous course and have been implemented:

- The Cancer TBL-module was moved from Part 2 of the course to Part 3. It fits better there and evened out the number of assignments between Part 2 and 3. Jessica Norrbom
- A workshop on sustainability has been added to the course. Jessica Norrbom, Ana Teixeira and Tade Idowu
- A session on laboratory safety and introduction to laboratory skills was added to the course. Jessica Norrbom
- A session focused on program introduction including code of conduct at KI, AI policy on the program was added as well as a workshop on academic writing and plagiarism in collaboration with KIB. Responsible: Jessica Norrbom



- The grading criteria for Part 2 and Part 3 were revised. Jessica Norrbom and TBL-theme responsible persons

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

According to the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation, a majority thought that they had "to a large extent" developed valuable expertise/skills (mean 4.0). When asked if they had achieved all intended learning outcomes, most answered that this was the case "to a large extent" (mean 4.0).

The answers to the question about a common theme running throughout the course were mainly answered "to a large extent" (mean 4.0). A majority thought that the modules of the course were well integrated (mean 4.2), except for two students that thought the modules were integrated to a small extent. Most students thought that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking to "a large or very large extent" (mean 4.2).

According to most students, the teachers had been open to ideas and opinions to "a large" or "very large" extent (mean 4.3). The answers to the question whether the structure and methods used were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes were mostly "to large extent or to a very large extent" (mean 4.3).

The psychosocial work environment was considered very good in general (mean 4.3) and most felt included in the group "to a large" or "to a very large" extent (mean 4.3). Only a few stated they experienced competition between students during the course (mean 2.5).

The answers to the question if the previous knowledge was sufficient for the course were evenly distributed from "to some extent" to "to a very large extent" (mean 4.0) and for the question if the course was challenging enough the answers ranged from "to a small extent" to "to a large extent" (mean 2.9).

When asked to describe what had been particularly good during the course, the students mentioned that they appreciated the broad content that provided a solid foundation in physiology and helped them define research interests. The knowledgeable and engaging lecturers were also brought up as well as the variety of learning methods, including journal clubs, group assignments, and case studies, which deepened understanding and encouraged discussion.

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

Strengths of the course: To use the TBL structure during the first course continues to be a good way to promote team work and for the students to get to know each other and reduce competition between students. The engaged and knowledgeable teachers that contribute to the development of the course are a great asset. The unique opportunity to have both basic and clinical research within the department that could be even more used in upcoming courses.



Weaknesses of the course: It is challenging to design the course so that students with diverse backgrounds will all learn as much as possible and at the same time be challenged enough. The structure of the written assignments has also been discussed and will be altered during the upcoming course.

4. Other views

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

Overall, the course worked well, and the variety of teaching methods are appreciated.

We will make sure that the assignments for Part 3 are released at a similar time in the respective TBL modules and look over the number of assignments in December/January when there is an overlap between two courses.

During the spring of 2025, the program syllabus will be revised. The new syllabus is planned to be in use from the autumn semester of 2026. In this process some changes will be made to the present course. One change that has been suggested is to shorten Part 1 and remove the written examination and add written examinations during Part 2 and 3 instead of the written assignments. As a step toward this, Part 2 will be examined with a written examination already in 2025, and from 2026 the rest of the planned changes will be implemented in the new syllabus.

- A co-course responsible person with expertise in pharmacology has been appointed for the upcoming semester. He will work with the course director to integrate and visualize the pharmacology elements better and to include more applied pharmacology and a closer connection to the industry. Jessica Norrbom and Shane Wright, the preparations for the upcoming course will start in March 2025.
- Change the individual assignments in Part 2 to a written examination with SBA and short-answer questions that takes place at the end of Part 2. Jessica Norrbom, spring and autumn 2025.

Appendices:

4FF000 HT23 utan fritext