

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 5BD002	Course title Biostatistics 2: methods and applications	Credits 7.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT-2025	Dates 1 Sept-2 Nov 2025	

Course Director Arvid Sjölander	Examiner Arvid Sjölander
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course Anna Johansson, Cecilia Lundholm, Alexander Ploner, Robert Karlsson, Ralf Kuja-Halkola	Other participating teachers Gustav Jonsson, Jiayao Lei, Letizia Orsini, Therese Andersson

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 35	Number passed at final course day 32	Response frequency course valuation survey 40%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) Course council		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students This document will be put on the course web page.		

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: 2025-11-21
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2025-11-21

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

This was the first time the course was given.

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.)

The mean was between 5.3 and 5.9 on all quantitative responses (6 grade scales, where 6 is best), which indicates that the students were generally very happy with the course. They gave a lot of suggestions on how to improve it in the free text. However, a problem with most of these suggestions is that there appears to be no particular trend or pattern. For instance, one student wrote:

"...perhaps the section on ML estimators (familiar + fairly concrete) could be introduced before the section on M estimators (unfamiliar + more abstract). And then M estimation can be explained as a

generalization of ML estimation, rather than explaining ML estimation as a special case of M estimation.”

However, since no other student suggested this modification, it is reasonable to assume that the other students were satisfied (or at least not dissatisfied) with having M estimation first, then ML estimation (e.g. going from the general to the specific, instead of the other way around).

Some comments/suggestions even contradict each other, e.g., “Too much self-study” vs “Good level and amount of self study.”, and “the course contents was arguably a bit too basic and/or slow-paced” vs “Some sections in the compendium were a little hard to understand”.

The only clear trend I could find was that several students thought the workload was somewhat uneven: too little in the beginning of the course, and too much at the end of the course.

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

Strengths of the course:

I personally felt that the course went quite well, and that the flipped classroom format suited the students.

Weaknesses of the course:

I agree with the students that the workload is uneven. However, this is a consequence of the fact that SU and KTH scheduled their courses first, and we got the leftovers. Also, KTH had exam period during the week at the end of the course when we got most lecture time.

Another possible weakness that there is perhaps too much diverse material in the course (missing data, causal inference, consulting, omics...) However, none of the students complained about that.

3. Other views

None.

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.)

Align the scheduling better with SU and KTH, if possible. The course director and the program director are responsible for that.

I will also look into the course material and see if it can be improved, following the students' suggestions and comments.

Appendices: