

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4TX032	Course title Regulatory toxicity testing	Credits 10
Semester (VT/HT-year) HT24		

Course leader/examiner Annika Hanberg	Other teacher(s) responsible for major part(s) (if applicable) Charlotte Nilsson
-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of registered students (at 3-week check) 19	Number of students that passed at end of course (after regular session) 19	Response rate in KI survey (%) 95%
Other methods for influence by students (besides KI survey) Course council, Padlet open during the course		
How and when is feedback of KI survey results given to students? At programme website		

1. Description of any changes made since last course event (based on for example feedback from previous students)

A tutor meeting with a biostatistics teacher was removed based on feedback from previous students (not necessary). A seminar on safety assessment of non-small-molecules with toxicologists (and alumni) from AstraZeneca was added.

2. Brief summary of the KI survey

(Based on students' quantitative answers and major feedback from free-text answers)

In general, the students appreciated the course very much. As always, a few students do not like this much of collaboration, "unclear" instructions, and/or travelling to RISE in Södertälje. But the vast majority was happy with their experience, their tutors, what they learnt.

KI or programme-specific question	Average result -(1-worst, 5-best)
In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	4.2
In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.5
In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.5
In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g. analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	4.6
In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.4
The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.2
The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.4
I was actively participating in learning activities.	4.9
When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	4.6
What is your overall experience of the course?	4.1

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? (1= far too little, 2= to little, 3= appropriate, 4= too much, 5= far too much)	2.8
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

3. Course coordinator's reflections on the course and the results:

The course was successful and the collaboration between students worked very well. The course heavily relies on collaboration between students and a few students always dislike collaboration and group work. However, the course is mimicking real-life work which includes collaboration.

4. Other comments:**5. Course coordinator's conclusions and suggestions for changes:**

The collaboration between students varies from group to group and needs to be monitored during the course. In addition, some changes have to be made as RISE will reorganize in the coming months.
