

Course analysis

Course code	Course title	Credits
5BD001	Survival analysis with applications in medicine	7.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr)	Dates	
VT-25	2025-01-20 to 2025-03-28	

Course Director	Examiner	
Mark Clements	Mark Clements	
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course	Other participating teachers	
Mark Clements	Paul Dickman, Arvid Sjölander, Jiayao Lei, Enoch Chen	

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 37	Number passed at final course day 35	Response frequency course valuation survey 14/37=38%		
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 week 9 of the course.				
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: 2025-04-25 The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2025-04-25

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

This was the first course occasion. In outline, the course included: lecture material; computing exercises; a compulsory group activity for reading and interpreting an article; and a compulsory individual-based take-home examination. The classroom activities also included small group discussions, code presentations, a journal article discussion with the lead author. A course council was completed in the second to last week.

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.)

There were only 14/37 respondents. From the respondents, it was clear that the course could be considerably improved. For the students' overall opinion of the course, 2 evaluated the course as poor, 7 as okay, 4 as good and 1 as very good. Good evaluations were received for "In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content" (mean 4.6) and "When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher /supervisor for guidance" (mean=4.4). The lowest evaluations were for "In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course" (mean 3.1) and "To what extent do you feel that the workload during the course was reasonable in relation to the extent of the



course/number of credits awarded?" (mean 3.2). For the latter question, it is not clear from the question (or the written responses) whether the workload was too heavy or too light.

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

Strengths of the course:

Based on the student feedback and our experience with the class, some aspects of the course worked well: the compulsory group activity reviewing an article showed that the course participants had understood much of the course material; some of the computing exercises led to insights; and the class discussions were very good. Moreover, many of the take-home examinations were of a high or very high quality.

It was clear that the teachers were open to student feedback.

Weaknesses of the course:

There were many weaknesses.

First, the timetable did not go to plan. There were at least three contributing factors: (a) the class was more heterogeneous in their background in statistical theory than anticipated; (b) it took longer to deliver the lecture material than planned; and (c) there were scheduling conflicts, such that the teaching finished at week 8.

Second, there were too few compulsory activities and possibly too much teaching material.

Third, feedback from the course council suggested that it may be possible to pass the take-home examination using generative AI. We undertook two individual-based oral assessments for those not able to attend the compulsory group activity and we were impressed with the quality of those discussions. This suggests combining a take-home examination with an individual-based oral assessment.

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 is room to improve the course, including:

- Better planning to ensure that the timetable is followed and that the delivery of course material is predictable.
- More compulsory activities, including: early formative assessment; more compulsory group presentations (e.g. some of the computing exercises); and more summative assessments throughout the course (e.g. fortnightly).
- Less lecture material. This could be achieved by more consistent use of the course textbook.
- To revise the content, we will: review the required statistical theory at the start of the course; include the lecture material on counting processes; move the R language-specific material to a separate module; and work through proofs on the whiteboard (rather than using Beamer).

Appendices: None