

## Course analysis (course evaluation) – Biomedicine Bachelor Programme

<b>Course code</b> 1BI049	<b>Course title</b> Molecular Medicine - Oncology	<b>Credits</b> 15 ECTS
<b>Semester</b> Autumn	<b>Period</b> 2022-08-29 – 2022-10-28	

<b>Course coordinator</b> Nick Tobin (NT)	<b>Examiner</b> Nick Tobin (NT)
<b>Teacher in charge of component</b> Veronica Höiom (PBLs) Galina Selivanova, Lars-Gunnar Larsson, Sylvain Peugeot, Mohammad Alzrigat (Labs) Pär Villner (Biostatistics)	<b>Other participating teachers</b> A range of teachers, both from within and outside the Onk-Pat and MTC, including both clinicians and researchers (from both KI and KS).

<b>Number of registered students during the three week check</b> 48	<b>Number approved on the last course date</b> 48	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 18 (38%)
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> <p>Students were repeatedly encouraged to provide ongoing feedback to the course coordinator (NT) who was present at all lectures (both physical and online) for the duration of the course. NT also sought opinions from the students before or after lectures. In addition, students were reminded that they could contact their class representatives with their views for discussion at a course council. The council was held towards the end of the course with class representatives.</p>		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students</b> <p>The 2021 course survey was made available on the course webpage (Canvas) and Drupal for the incoming 2022 students. At the course introductory presentation NT highlighted the strengths of the course and what changes that had been made to improve upon the perceived weaknesses - as taken from the 2021 survey and course council. The importance of receiving feedback on the course was also discussed along with demonstration of how feedback from previous years has helped to shape the structure and content of course in its current form.</p>		

### 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: 27<sup>th</sup> Jan 2023

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on: 27<sup>th</sup> Jan 2023

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

- **Lecturers:** New lecturers were introduced to the course to (i) Replace previous lecturers who had left the course (e.g. new biostatistics and colorectal cancer lecturers)
- **Lab 2 planning:** We needed to change the timing of Lab 2 to allow more time for cell growth. This was based on our 2021 experiences.
- **Removed exam points for labs:** The students have been frustrated in recent years that their final mark depended solely on the final written course exam. As such, we trialled giving them 10% for completion of labs and a question worth 10% based on PBLs that they could prepare beforehand. This led to most of the class receiving an MVG grade in 2021. In 2022 we removed the points for labs and made the exam a little harder. This helped to give a better distribution of grades and was a positive change.

## **2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course**

*(Based on the course council)*

- Similarly to previous course years, the feedback we received was very positive. Students appreciated course organisation, the course structure and were very happy with PBLs contributing to their result.
- Some constructive feedback was also given, this included: (i) Some lecturers should be given constructive feedback about their presentation organisation, (ii) Most experiments failed in lab 2 owing to contamination, labs need to be cleaner and (iii) Lab 3 lectures over Zoom were not as appreciated as much as in other years

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

### ***Strengths of the course:***

- The course structure and organisation are very strong, this was mentioned by the students in the course council and verbally throughout the course
- We are very good at communicating with the students and they are left with the impression that we are engaged in their learning and understanding
- The connection to the oncology clinic with numerous lecturers and PBLs containing a clinical focus is central to the success of the course and highly appreciated by students
- The mix of lecturers, labs, PBLs and seminars has the combined effect of stimulating life-long learning. Often the students receive similar information but from clinical and research viewpoints, encouraging a deep understanding of the subject matter
- The digital elements we retained from during the pandemic have worked well and we may continue to use them e.g. Lab 3 is now completely digital

### ***Weaknesses of the course:***

- Some lectures can still be improved on, specifically by adding summary/ conclusions slides so it is clearer to the students what they are expected to know
- We were aware that the cleanliness of the lab for Lab 2 was not optimal, this will be taken care of for next year
- Having more practical work for Lab 3 may be worth exploring

#### **4. Other views**

The general atmosphere amongst the course leadership and organisation is one of positivity. The feedback we have received from students along with lecturers is both encouraging and motivating. We seem to have found a good balance between biological and clinical molecular oncology as well as between the number and structure of lectures, PBLs, seminars and labs.

#### **5. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes**

**(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)**

The overarching conclusion from the 2022 MM-O course should be one of positivity and optimism for future iterations based on a strong and well organised foundation. The following changes will however be made with the aim of improving the course based on student and teacher feedback:

- Lecturers will be reminded to add a summary slide on what subject matter is the most important from their presentation to make the lecture intended learning outcomes clearer. In addition, all lecturers will be given the feedback written by the students in the interest of continued improvement (Responsible: Nick Tobin)
- Lab 2 will be cleaned before use (Responsible: Nick Tobin and Galina Selivanova)
- We need to replace lecturers who have left e.g. PCM

#### **Appendices:**

N/A