Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4BI114	Course title Frontiers in Biomedicine: Research Project 1	Credits 15hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT25	Period March 26 - June 8, 2025	

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

Number of registered students during the three week check **58**	Number approved on the last course date **55**	Response frequency course valuation survey **48.3%**
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) **Meeting with course representatives to discuss survey and analysis.**		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students **Survey (without comments) published on open Kursweb Drupal. Discussed with student representatives and will be presented at the start of next 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

The course information was clarified and separated into general information e.g. for supervisors and specific information for the assessments.
Assessment criteria have been revised with clearer instructions to supervisors. The assessment criteria for the report were more specified for the respective sections of the report and more detailed information on the criteria were provided to already give some feedback on the various parts of the report.
Statement of AI usage was required for the written parts.
The word limit for the Methods part of the report was increased. A brief format check list was provided.
Projectors are generally permitted to be used in the examination session.
An online Q&A meeting was held prior to course start to inform and help students with finding projects.
Course changes were communicated to students in the kick-off meeting.

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 course appears to be appreciated by the students as it provides an opportunity to do research, learn new methods, get to know research groups etc. Students developed new skills and trained scientific thinking and reasoning as well as feedback.

Despite clarified information and extended communication, the information about the course still appears to be intricate to access and unclear at times. The limitation of the written work proves challenging. Students have difficulties finding projects partially due to the limited extend of the course.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course allows the students to learn a new method in the context of a short research project. This is an excellent opportunity to learn (new) methods, get aquainted with research in general and research groups at KI in particular. This allows students early on to build a network in scientific research. Students appreciate their own choice of research topic and group. Very relevant assessment with written report and discussion session. Progress meetings give students opportunities to discuss, meet, reflect on their project and progress. Focus is on lab work and not extensive writing.

Weaknesses of the course:

Information content is not always clear enough and/or difficult to find. Restriction on report length is too stringent. Peer-review exercise is repetitive (and similar to tasks on previous courses but good to have examples). Short time between peer-feedback and final report submission. Extend of course makes it difficult to find hosting labs/supervisors.

3. Other views

Klicka här för att ange text.

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.)

An early information meeting for this course will be conducted/offered ahead of the course – potentially online and/or in conjunction with other information sessions (BLo, J. Laurencikiene, M. Jonegård). General information about the project courses on the programme and this course will be provided on a separate (open) Canvas course to allow access at all times (and early) (BLo, J. Laurencikiene, course director of other project courses). This will include information for supervisors and expectations from these too (incl. framework for working hours). Consequently, specific information on the course's Canvas course will be more detailed and regrouped with separate information on the examination session. (BLo)

Progress meetings will be reviewed in extend (one vs two) and reporting (e.g. one or two reflections, group vs individual, or survey) as well as potential inclusion of other topics based on student's meeting discussions (e.g. sustainability, scientific documentation). These assignments in connection with progress meetings, like all other assignments on the course, will have fixed deadlines (BLo).

The peer-review exercise will be scrutinised if it is necessary at all or considered to be reduced in volume. Possibilities to instead assess the peer-review for the project summary will be considered (BLo, C. McGrath and J. Laurencikiene). Formal annotations should complement the peer-review of the project summary.

To allow more realistic writing but keeping the project report short, instructions for short reports from a life-science journal may be applied to the project report. This potentially increases the overall word count slightly. If possible, the materials & methods section should have fewer (or even no) restrictions to allow full descriptions of the methodological part of the project. Dedicated time during the course should be set aside for writing and peer-review (esp. applying pee-review comments) (BLo).

If possible, grouping will be streamlined to e.g. make the examining groups the same as the progress groups (BLo).

The examination session will be reviewed although not to change to a full presentation (see below) but rather to go back to handouts closer resembling a roundtable discussion, i.e. no projector. E.g. the session can be done in smaller groups (e.g. progress groups – see above) (BLo).

A ½ time control/discussion between student and supervisor shall be introduced where a preliminary assessment of the student can be discussed. In this way the student has a better view of their evaluation and possibility for improvement. (BLo)

The overall assessment of course will be discussed in various aspects. The assessment of the practical work by the supervisor is "out of the hands of the course organisation" and often more subjective than other

assessments. Therefore, it could be considered that the supervisor assessment either does not contribute to the 3 grade course scale (i.e. only be graded with G/U, the report determines then the final grade only) or the course grade may be change to a 2 grade system overall. Alternatively, different ways of assessing the students' performance may be introduced by e.g. assessing certain skills, achievements etc. rather than having scales for assessment areas (BLo, C. McGrath and J. Laurencikiene).

Note: the examination session in form of a roundtable discussion should not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination and hence different to other used ones and a very real situation. Sadly, this is very often misunderstood by the students (and even some examining teachers). In the future we will avoid the use of presentation and power-point and rather use *discussion* and *figures* in an attempt to avoid confusion with full on presentation using a presentation software package.

Appendices:

Survey