

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4BI116	Course title Applied Biomedical Communication and Professional Development	Credits 7.5 HP
Semester (VT/HT-yr) VT2025	Dates Feb 21st 2025 to March 25th 2025	

Course Director Matthew Kirkham (MK)	Examiner Lena Ström
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course <i>Main teachers: Scientific writing in biomedical research, 4.5 hp:</i> - Terese Bergfors <i>Main teachers: Personal Development and Applied Biomedical Communication, 3.0 hp</i> - Ana Oliveira - Natalie Jellinek	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students at the 3-week check: 59	Number passed at final course day: 43	Response frequency course valuation survey: 42%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) - Course council meet with course representatives- Held after the course is completed - Through continues discussions between course representatives and the course director during the course - Through Informal discussions between students and course director during the course		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students Course analysis is uploaded on to course website. Emailed to the course representatives Discussed in the Roll Call lecture		

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: Nov 1st 2025
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: Nov 1st 2025

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

- Global health and SDGs: Remove the repetitive elements and align more with previous courses. Try and make content more relevant to biomedical research and biomedical students. For example: How can biomedical students contribute to SDGs at KI?
- More focus in the introduction to scientific writing workshop on what is good research question and how this relates to experimental/study design. The aim is to help students decide on what they want to write about.

- Add more on why it is good to not to write about real data. This gives the student freedom and flexibility to focus on the writing process.
- Improve the AI workshops. Focus on the ethical aspects followed by the specific examples of how it could be used.
- Increase student information or awareness in the beginning of the course
 - the benefits of peer-to-peer feedback and specifically the benefit to the giver of the feedback.
 - Deadlines and which are the final submissions, and which are for draft text.
 - Move examples or more help for the students to choose the topics that they want to write on. Especially regarding the abstract submitted in the first week, repeat a lot that this is a draft and not the final graded submission.
- Spread out the graphic abstract workshops with self-study time and move the deadline to a little later to reduce student stress over the submission.

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.)

-Additional from discussion with the student representatives

Summary of students' student online survey

In general, 80% of the students that answered the survey thought the course was very good or good. The survey also demonstrated that the students felt that they had developed valuable expertise /skills during the course (mean score of 3.9 out of 5) and that the feedback the students received was important for their development and learning (mean score 4.1 out of 5). Furthermore, most of the students felt to a large extent or very large extent that the course structure was good (mean score 3.8 out of 5), the workload was reasonable (mean score 3.6 out of 5) and examination was relevant (mean score 4.1 out of 5).

Summary of responses for student online survey on improvements

Students found the course enjoyable, demanding but rewarding, and highly relevant for their future research and communication tasks. Here are some common themes:

Practical and hands-on learning: Students valued the applied nature of assignments, including manuscript writing, graphical abstracts, the Affinity software workshop, and public presentation tasks.

Constructive feedback culture: Peer review sessions and instructor feedback were highly appreciated for improving writing and presentation quality across different stages of the course.

Engaging and varied content: Activities such as the Global Health Exhibition, storytelling circles, creative design exercises, and the board game added variety and enjoyment.

Skill development: Students highlighted improvements in scientific writing, presentation skills, graphical communication, and confidence using digital tools.

Students suggested that the course could be improved by reducing workload, clarifying structure, providing more practical support for assignments, and improving scheduling and resource organization. Here are some common themes:

Better space out assignments: Many found it stressful to have the manuscript, graphical abstract, and presentation due in close succession, and suggested spreading deadlines.

Provide timelines from the start: Students wanted a detailed, chronological overview of all assignments, deadlines, and requirements early in the course to avoid confusion and frustration.

Improve Canvas organization: The separation into tracks was seen as confusing. Suggestions included organizing materials chronologically or by week, separating mandatory from optional tasks, and consolidating resources in one place.

Several commented that graphical abstract and figure workshops lacked practical training (e.g., Affinity software use). They recommended in-class tutorials with exercises rather than short outsourced videos.

Most relevant feedback from Student reps

- In general, the course was well received, and most students gained valuable skills for their future careers.
- Moving the personal development assignments into the classroom worked well. However, students still thought that they were not so useful. A suggestion was to turn them more into classroom discussions with Padlet comments. This would reduce the number of assignments. If students were not present, they must do the online submission.
- Students felt very stressed at the end of the course. Is there a possibility to move the deadlines across the course?
- The student rep said that it still was not always clear when deadlines were. This was not helped by the Canvas structure.

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

Strengths of the course (what worked well)

- The changes to the course, such as including more R in creating figures and the use of games, worked well.
- The student had a better appreciation for feedback this year.
- The students appreciate the practical tips and workshops on writing and graphic design.
- The students also really appreciated the career awareness and personal development part of the course, which gives them a better perspective on career paths and their own professional development.
- Most students felt that they gained valuable skills from the course.

Weaknesses of the course (what could be improved)

- Though there have been improvements this year, the students still found similar things as problems and, as such, should be improved.
- There was still some confusion about deadlines.

- The students struggled at the beginning of the course to come up with the subject that they were going to write on.
- Students still do not like the structure of the Canvas pages.

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.)

- The main strengths of the course are the diversity in the teachers, course moments and assignments.
- The course is evolving each year.

Possible areas to improve:

- Review number of assignments: Especially as the career development part of the course is highly dependent on one teacher and needs to be altered to make it more sustainable. Move more of the assignments to 100% classroom and have the current online versions only if students are not present.
- Review the main deadlines for the assessments that are graded. These are the most stressful for the students and see if it is possible to move any. Is it possible to spread the deadlines throughout the course?
- Improve Canvas structure, maybe by weeks rather than themes.
- Generative AI is changing the way we access, review, and communicate information. Review when and how GenAI needs to be included in the course.
- Provide more information before the course starts to help students come prepared.
- This year there was more time and effort to increasing the visibility of feedback. To possible maintain this review whether the course syllabus needs to be changed.

Appendices: None