Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code	Course title	Credits
5BD002	Biostatistics 2: methods and applications	7.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT-2026	**Dates** August 31 – November 2, 2026	

Course Director	Examiner
Arvid Sjölander	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	Number passed at final course day	Response frequency course valuation survey
24	13	45.83%
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: 2026-11-16
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2026-11-16

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

This was the second time the course was given. Based on the previous course evaluation, we did not make any big changes to the course. Some minor changes were made, e.g., addition/deletion/restructuring of some course material.

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.)

Only 11 out of 24 students responded to the evaluation. In my experience, this is the usual response rate for the course evaluations at KI. The value of an evaluation is seriously compromised when the response rate is so low, since those who respond could very well be a highly selected and non-representative sample of all students. Thus, I'm reluctant to draw any conclusions from the result below.

The mean was between 4.8 and 5.9 on all quantitative responses (6 grade scales, where 6 is best), which indicates that those students who completed the evaluation were generally very happy with the course. They gave some suggestions on how to improve it in the free text.

As in the previous evaluation, it was hard to see any trend or pattern in the responses. Some students felt that the course load was reasonable, other that it was too high; some students enjoyed the flipped classroom format, other would have preferred more traditional lectures.

The strongest agreement I could discern, was that four students commented on that the three parts of the course are very different and should perhaps be separated into different courses. However, four students is still a very small, and potentially highly selected group, so it would not be sensible to make major changes to the course based on this observation.

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.

My major concern is that almost 50% of the students (10/24) failed the exam. I suspect that this has to do with the low attendance at lectures, and I will consider making these mandatory.

Weaknesses of the course:

I agree with the four students that there is perhaps too much diverse material in the course (missing data, causal inference, consulting, omics…) However, only 4/24 students complained about it, and changing this requires a major restructuring, so I will probably not do this.

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.)

See above.

Appendices: