Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 5BD001	**Course title** Survival analysis with applications in medicine	**Credits** 7.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr) VT-26	**Dates** 2026-01-21 to 2026-03-19	

Course Director Mark Clements	**Examiner** Mark Clements
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course Mark Clements, Enoch Yi-Tung Chen, Jonatan Hedberg, Paul Lambert	**Other participating teachers** Paul Dickman

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 26	**Number passed at final course day** 26	**Response frequency course valuation survey** 11
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) The students provided feedback throughout the course. We also had a course council on 2026-03-13.		
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: 2026-04-21
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2026-04-21.

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

Marked changes from the first course occasion:

- Assessment was changed to two take-home assignments (2/3) and one sit-down exam (1/3) (based on student feedback).
- Significant restructuring of the course material:
  - Removed half of the previous lecture material (based on student feedback)
  - Added more exercises (based on student feedback)
  - Added lectures on counting processes, frailties, competing risks, multistate models and dependent censoring.
- Teaching was shared between four lecturers.

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.)

- Student feedback from the course council
  - Have an earlier course council

- The workload was too heavy for 7.5 credits
- The counting processes lecture was mathematically too heavy
- Do lab reviews at the end of each lab
- The workload was too heavy at the end of the course
- Unclear what would be in the sit-down exam (I covered some of this in the end of course wrap-up).

- Student feedback from the survey:
  - Only 11/26 responded.
  - Clearly one student was dissatisfied with the course. They expressed that the G range was too broad (52-83%) and that the course design did not encourage learning. They did not provide other written feedback.
  - Of the other ten respondents, they were generally positive for most of the questions.
  - 10/11 respondents reported that the workload was too high for the number of credits. This is a key finding.
  - 3/11 reported 3 or less for "the course as a whole was good". This is a key challenge to address for the next course occasion.
  - Much of the written feedback is similar to the feedback from the course council. Importantly, the exam was too short on time (1.5 hours should have been 3-4 hours) and too difficult.

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

Strengths of the course:

- Sharing the teaching led to better course delivery.
- The course material is becoming better defined.

Weaknesses of the course:

- The course load was too high and too uneven.
- The exam was too short and too difficult.
- Unclear which topics to include in the second half of the course. There is also a need to provide a better road-map or motivation for the topics.
- Not all of the computing exercises had reviews.

3. Other views

See 4.

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.)

This course occasion was better planned and better executed than the first course occasion. This evolution is a good sign.

The two take-home assignments were generally excellent. In contrast, the results from the sit-down exam were much poorer. Possible explanations for this discrepancy: the time for the exam was too short; the exam was too hard; the students did not have time to prepare; the students did not know which material to study; the students knew they were likely to have already passed the course; and/or the students did not know the material.

It was clear from the feedback during and after the course that the course can be further improved.

For the next course occasion:

- Make the sit-down exam at least 50% of the grade and give a much longer time to complete the exam.
- Be more explicit throughout the course how the content relates to the intended learning outcomes.
- Remove one of the take-home assignments to lighten the assessment load.
- Considerably reduce the course material:
  - Remove some of the material on counting processes
  - Move some technical material to supplementary materials/appendices (e.g. uncommon probability distributions)
  - Remove one or more of the topics (e.g. dependent censoring or multistate models)
  - Simplify some of the exercises.
- Plan for a review of each computing lab – at the end of the lab works well.
- Even out the load:
  - Move the single assignment to week 5 or 6
  - Finish the group presentations earlier.
- Do two course councils, including a council at the mid-point of the course.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the teachers of this course occasion. Their contributions substantially improved the course and bodes well for the future.

Appendices: