

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4TX019	Course title Degree project in toxicology	Credits 37.5
Semester (VT/HT-year) HT24/VT25		

Course leader/examiner Annika Hanberg, Johanna Ziliacus	Other teacher(s) responsible for major part(s) (if applicable)
---	---

Number of registered students (at 3-week check) 19	Number of students that passed at end of course (after regular session) 9	Response rate in KI survey (%) 74
Other methods for influence by students (besides KI survey) Frequent communication with students, both individually and at monthly meetings		
How and when is feedback of KI survey results given to students? Published at programme website after the course		

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

The course has been developed and revised over the years based on students' suggestions and teachers' ideas. This year, a new task was included, to make an oral popular pitch of the student's project. The requirement that students should discuss their project from an AOP perspective was removed. New assessment criteria were developed and applied, based partly on the new KI criteria for degree projects.

2. Brief summary of the KI survey

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

The students were very positive about the course. Many of them mentioned the wide range of possible projects, both at universities and companies, as well as the real-life and independent experience, as strengths. Students also appreciated the regular contact and support from the course directors, as well as workshops to prepare for writing the thesis at the monthly meetings. Some students suggested a longer project.

KI or programme-specific question	Average result -(1-worst, 5-best)
In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	4.9
In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.9
In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.9
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).	4.9
In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	5.0
The course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.8
The examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.	4.9
I was actively participating in learning activities.	5.0
When/if I had questions or problems with the course content, I felt that I could turn to my teacher/supervisor for guidance.	5.0

What is your overall experience of the course?	4.9
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)	3.2

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

The course works very well and is highly appreciated by the students. The inclusion of course directors as teacher opponents is very successful and increases the level of discussions of the projects. It also lets the course directors be involved at the end of the programme and experience the development of the students.

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

The course is highly appreciated by the students, and the quality is high. The oral popular pitch was very successful and well received by the students. This will be kept for next time. The project will be longer (45 credits) in the new programme syllabus starting from autumn 2026.
