Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
4BI107	Frontiers in Biomedicine	10.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr)	**Dates**	
HT24 (autumn 2024)	1st September – 15th October 2024	

Course Director	Examiner
Rachel Fisher	Rachel Fisher
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course	**Other participating teachers**
• Circulation, Metabolism and Endocrinology: Jurga Laurencikiene + Ljubica Matic • Cell Biology, Development and Regeneration: Karolina Kublickiene + Lena Ström • Immunology and Infection: Benedict Chambers • Neuroscience: Fredrik Piehl + Maria Ankarcrona • Tumour Biology: Margareta Wilhelm • Course Administrator: Mari Liljefors	Within each "track" there were a number of different teachers with expertise in the different topics that were covered. In addition, the course contained a "generic track" with three focus areas: • Academic writing: Müjde Nordling + Gabriella Ekman • Rhetoric: Peter Lind • Ethics: Henrik Ahlenius

Number of registered students at the 3-week check	Number passed at final course day	Response frequency course valuation survey
58	52 (6 students were required to submit revisions of an assignment)	63.8%

Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey)
A course council, open to all students, was held towards the end of the course (on 11th October). The meeting was held in Zoom and approximately 65% of the students participated. Minutes were taken (by a student representative) and placed on Canvas. Teachers Rachel Fisher, Jurga Laurencikiene, Lena Ström, Karolina Kublickiene and Fredrik Piehl attended the course council + course administrator Mari Liljefors.
During the course, students were encouraged to give feedback directly to the course director or track leaders. It was also possible to post feedback on Canvas. Contact with the course administrator was encouraged.

Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students
2024-10-30 (survey placed on courses webpages in both Canvas and Drupal)

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: 2025-04-11
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2025-04-11

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

- The organisation of the journal clubs and tasks in Canvas was standardised as much as possible across the tracks to create a more uniform arrangement and to promote clarity.
- Tasks, journal club articles and overall contents were updated to reflect the latest areas of research in each track.
- The bioethics workshop was revised to improve progression across the programme (and from bachelor to master level).

- A policy regarding the use of generative AI was introduced and discussed.
- The time available at the end of the course to complete the "generic track" (press release, ethical reflection + rhetoric presentation) was increased.
- The research project fair that was previously included in the course was removed. Instead, it will be replaced by a fair open to all biomedicine programmes (under responsibility of the Programme Committee). This change was not implemented as a result of student feedback (the fair has been very popular), but rather due to the decision to expand the event to include all students under the Biomedicine Programme Committee. However, its removal enabled time to be created in the course for students to work on their generic track.

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.)

Students were generally satisfied with the course and appreciated the design that gave them a good introduction to the Master's Programme in Biomedicine (and their fellow students) and to KI as a whole. While the course was considered to be challenging, with the multiple assignments/deadlines being stressful, it was also viewed as rewarding. The course was viewed to have promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning.

- Positive comments: Most respondents praised the course for being interesting, relevant, well-structured, and well-taught. Students appreciated the diversity of topics, the quality of lectures and seminars, and the opportunities for learning new skills and methods. Direct interaction with active researchers at KI through lectures, seminars and the journal clubs, lead by authors of the articles, was greatly appreciated. The multiple activities in the course that promoted critical thinking, and the development of presentation skills were highlighted.
- Negative comments: The course was too demanding and too fast-paced. Differences in requirements/organisation of the assignments across tracks were confusing/stressful. There was a lack of feedback and/or grade justification was unclear, and assessment criteria were not optimal.
- Suggestions for improvement: Provide examples of assignments (tasks) to clarify expectations. Clarify instructions and ensure workload is similar across all tracks. Improve/increase feedback on assignments.

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

Strengths of the course:
- A broad introduction to ongoing and state-of-the-art research and researchers at KI, achieved through lectures, journal clubs and tasks/assignments
- Generic track providing training in scientific writing, ethics and rhetoric
- Multiple opportunities to give oral presentations and to learn from this (combined with the rhetoric part of the generic track)
- Group work providing multiple opportunities for students to get to know one another (important since the first course in the programme)
- A range of different assignments connected to the latest research at KI
- An emphasis on critical thinking and analysis
- Excellent track organisers + engaged and enthusiastic teachers
- Structured organisation of the course web on Canvas providing access to information and course material, combined with excellent course administration

Weaknesses of the course:
- The introduction to the course as a whole and to the component tracks does not always provide students with the relevant information at the right time, and provide clarity regarding design/organisation/expectations
- Too intensive at times with short deadlines
- The challenge of grading group assignments and the corresponding assessment criteria
- Uneven delivery of structured feedback/grade justification on the multiple assignments

3. Other views

Generally, the course ran well. Students and teachers enjoyed the format, which allowed for extensive interaction and discussion. Teachers were impressed by the performance of the students.

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.)
- Continue to refine the introduction to the course clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc.
  Responsible = Course Director
  Implement in the first two days of the course in HT25
- Continue to improve the introduction to each of the tracks to clarify the organisation, goals, expectations etc
  Responsible = Track leaders
  Implement at the start of each track block in HT25
- Review grading within the course and across the tracks. Discuss with track leaders to ensure similar assessment procedures, marking, grading etc. Revise assessment criteria as required.
  Responsible = Course Director/track leaders
  Implement discussion and review of practices prior to start of course in HT25
- Clarify justification of the grade for each assignment. Implement use of rubrics in Canvas to align assessment criteria with grading.
  Responsible = Course Director/track leaders
  Implement discussion and review of practices prior to start of course in HT25
- Develop discussions around the use of generative AI and how it should (or should not) be used.
  Responsible = Course Director/Track leaders/academic writing teacher
  Implement HT25

Appendices:

Course survey HT24