Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
1BI039	Chemical Biology	8hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT25	**Period** April 29 – June 8, 2025	

Course coordinator	Examiner
Bernhard Lohkamp	**Bernhard Lohkamp**
Teacher in charge of component	**Other participating teachers** various

Number of registered students during the three week check	Number approved on the last course date	Response frequency course valuation survey
67	**49**	**55.2%**

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)
Course committee meetings, one after two weeks and one after the exam.

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students
Survey (without comments) published on the kursweb page (Drupal). Discussed survey with the course committee. Changes etc will be presented at the start of the new course.

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: **27/06/25**
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 27/06/25

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

Both lab manuals have been revised and clarified. A written statement on the use of AI based on the PN's guidelines was introduced for the written work.
The content for the inhibitor lab report was reduced.
The seminar on structural biology analysis & methods has been allocated more time and given two parallel sessions.
A textbook covering the majority of the course was introduced but not integrated (due to illness).

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations 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.)

The students were overwhelmed with the course content despite learning new, interesting information and mostly achieved the intended learning outcomes. Some students felt that the exam was still too comprehensive, specific and long, the computer lab too difficult and overall, too much content described. Again, the underlying thread in the course which holds the different parts together was less visible (again) but not necessarily for all students. The computer lab was perceived as interesting and fun by some and demanding, difficult and long by others. The group, project work was overall well received but topics and

trial presentation questioned. The lab manuals appear still to require some more clarification. Students would appreciate more specific and fewer reading instructions/source and/or adjustment to the textbook.

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

Strengths of the course:

Most teaching staff, topic, and content as such is appreciated by the students. The computer lab incl. introduction of Chimera appears well liked and teaches the students a lot. The given seminars are appreciated by the students. The course integrates several topics learned in previous courses and offers real research laboratory sessions.

Weaknesses of the course:

The lab reports were challenging and required more time than expected and scheduled for a number of students. Some instructions in the lab manual need clarification and/or be extended. The computer lab was very challenging and time consuming for some students. The exam was experienced by some as too difficult requiring very specific knowledge (however results were comparable to previous years) and the overall content of the course too much. Lab report assessment was often lacking feedback. Some scheduling could be improved, e.g. the return for the wet lab report was after the exam (feedback could have been valuable for the exam). Lack of defined theory content for some parts. In seminars and labs teachers had different approaches, content, knowledge etc. .

3. Other views

Despite few changes in the course the overall rating was significantly lower than the previous year probably due to the perception of a more difficult exam (according to the comments in the survey). Additionally, there was a minor mistake in the exam, but this was immediately communicated to the students after the exam and corrected in favour of the students (i.e. no one got a worse grade because of this). Overall, the exam results were comparable to that of the previous years, even slightly better.
Due to several holidays during the course's allocated time, scheduling is always challenging resulting several compromises (in some years like this even more).

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

(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)

The lab compendia will be revised further in different ways. The wet lab manual requires some minor updates based on the experiences this year (BLo, HAx, FMa). Further reductions in content of the wet lab report will be considered as well as a seminar/tutorial on related data analysis (BLo).
The computer lab incl. manual will be restructured to increase the flow and include a Chimera introduction in connection with a quiz using a "simpler" model protein (BLo, MEk).
The recommended text book will be integrated into the course content to define it better and formulate clearer aims (BLo, P. Arvidsson, M. Haraldsson). In this context some reduction in content and/or detail will be considered as well as the introduction of more seminars. This may include reduction of the methodological background to shift towards functional analysis. Videos quizzes will be mandatory for the methods/topics which are not covered by lectures but seminars only to ensure everyone received the relevant knowledge (BLo).
The exam will be given some more time (or splitting the exam into a MCQ part plus essay will be considered). If possible, the lab reports should be scheduled to be returned before the exam. (BLo)

Appendices:

Survey