

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4BI107	Course title Frontiers in Biomedicine	Credits 10.5
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT25 (autumn 2025)	Dates 1 st September – 14 th October 2025	

Course Director Rachel Fisher	Examiner Rachel Fisher
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulation, Metabolism and Endocrinology: Jurga Laurencikiene + Ljubica Matic • Cell Biology, Development and Regeneration: Karolina Kublickiene + Lena Ström • Immunology and Infection: Benedict Chambers • Tumour Biology: Margareta Wilhelm + Sylvain Peugot • Neuroscience: Fredrik Piehl + Maria Ankarcrona • Course Administrator: Mari Liljefors 	Other participating teachers Within each “track” there were a number of different teachers with expertise in the different topics that were covered. In addition, the course contained a “generic track” with three focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic writing: Gabriella Ekman + Mjude Nordling • Rhetoric: Peter Lind • Ethics: Henrik Ahlenius

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 46	Number passed at final course day 24 (22 students were required to submit revisions of an assignment)	Response frequency course valuation survey 47.8%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) A course council, open to all students, was held towards the end of the course (on 9 th October). The meeting was held in Zoom and approximately 50% of the students participated. Minutes were taken (by a student representative) and placed on Canvas. Teachers Rachel Fisher, Jurga Laurencikiene, Karolina Kublickiene and Fredrik Piehl attended the course council + course administrator Mari Liljefors. During the course, students were encouraged to give feedback directly to the course director or track leaders. It was also possible to post feedback on Canvas. Contact with the course administrator was encouraged.		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students 2026-04-13 (survey placed on courses webpages in both Canvas and Drupal)		

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: 2026-04-13

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2026-04-13

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

- Assessment criteria were developed/improved to clarify requirements, highlight areas of particular importance (eg scientific content of a task), strengthen opportunities for students to self-assess, and increase standard practices throughout the course. Individual meetings were held between course director, educational developer and track leaders to review the criteria from HT24, identify the potential weighting of different criteria to emphasise the particular

importance of certain criteria, clarify the definitions of G and VG for all criteria, and produce revised criteria for HT25.

- Assessment rubrics (corresponding to the assessment criteria) were introduced in Canvas for use by teachers when grading assignments. The aim was to improve clarity regarding grade justification and provide specific assessment of each criterion. Free text comment fields were included for each criterion.
- The submission deadline for the rhetoric presentation (slides) was moved slightly later, closer to the rhetoric presentations, to increase flexibility for students to make last minute updates to their slides.
- Continued work to standardise the organisation in Canvas of the journal clubs and tasks across the five tracks.
- Some examples of assignments (tasks) submitted by students in previous years were provided to clarify expectations.

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.)

Students were generally satisfied with the course and appreciated the design that gave them a good introduction to the Master's Programme in Biomedicine (and their fellow students) and to KI as a whole. While the course was considered to be challenging, with the multiple assignments/deadlines being stressful, it was also viewed as rewarding. The course was viewed to have provided good opportunities for active learning, and the examination was relevant in relation to the learning outcomes. Students reported that they felt included and respected during the course.

- Positive comments: Most respondents praised the course for being interesting, relevant, well-structured, and well-taught. Students appreciated the diversity of topics, the quality of lectures and seminars, and the opportunities for learning new skills and methods. Direct interaction with active researchers at KI through lectures, seminars and the journal clubs, lead by authors of the articles, was greatly appreciated. The multiple activities in the course that promoted critical thinking, teamwork, and the development of presentation skills were highlighted. The assessment rubrics in Canvas were appreciated.
- Negative comments: The course was too demanding and too fast-paced. Differences in requirements/organisation of the assignments across tracks were confusing/stressful. There was a lack of feedback and/or grade justification was unclear. The examination/assessment of the journal clubs varied between evaluators. The content of some of the lectures in the generic track was too basic/repetitive.

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

Strengths of the course:

- A broad introduction to ongoing and state-of-the-art research and researchers at KI, achieved through lectures, journal clubs and tasks/assignments
- Generic track providing training in scientific writing, ethics and rhetoric
- Multiple opportunities to give oral presentations and to learn from this (combined with the rhetoric part of the generic track)
- Group work providing multiple opportunities for students to get to know one another (important since the first course in the programme)
- A range of different assignments connected to the latest research at KI
- An emphasis on critical thinking and analysis
- Excellent track organisers + engaged and enthusiastic teachers

- Structured organisation of the course web on Canvas providing access to information and course material, combined with excellent course administration

Weaknesses of the course:

- The introduction to the course as a whole and to the component tracks does not always provide students with the relevant information at the right time, and provide clarity regarding design/organisation/expectations
- Too intensive at times with short deadlines
- The challenge of grading group assignments
- Although assessment criteria were developed/improved for HT25, this is an area requiring continual improvement
- Uneven delivery of structured feedback/grade justification on the multiple assignments

3. Other views

Generally, the course ran well. Students and teachers enjoyed the format, which allowed for extensive interaction and discussion. Teachers were impressed by the performance of the students.

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.)

- Continue to refine the introduction to the course clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations, responsibilities etc. Introduce discussions around group work and setting ground rules.
Responsible = Course Director
Implement in the first two days of the course in HT26
- Continue to improve the introduction to each of the tracks to clarify the organisation, goals, expectations etc
Responsible = Track leaders
Implement at the start of each track block in HT26
- Continue with the development work concerning grading/assessment. Review with track leaders + educational developer the changes that were introduced in HT25 (= revised assessment criteria and introduction of assessment rubrics in Canvas) with the goal of ensuring transparent and reproducible assessment, and continuity regarding assessment practices across the tracks. For HT26, revise assessment criteria and rubrics in Canvas accordingly to incorporate experience gained in HT25 and make further developments/improvements.
Responsible = Course Director/track leaders
Implement prior to start of course in HT26
- Improve consistency of the examination of journal clubs across the five tracks. Discuss with track leaders and ask them to hold a meeting with all journal club leaders prior to the course to agree on organisation, requirements, assessment etc.
Responsible = Course Director/track leaders
Implement prior to start of course in HT26
- Review content and organisation of the generic track. Review bioethics workshop and written reflection (=examination) together with educational developer to establish whether the existing format leads to meaningful learning and what modifications could be introduced for HT26. Review the input into the course by Academic Writing Support (KIB) in the form of the workshops organised. Focus on the press release as an examination assignment and consider revising to acknowledge the potential use/misuse of generative AI. Revise workshops and examination assignment accordingly together with Academic Writing Support and an educational developer.



**Karolinska
Institutet**

Responsible = Course Director/Academic Writing Support

Implement prior to start of course HT26

- Review the allocation of ECTS to the different parts of the course, specifically regarding the tasks (Disease mechanisms and translational medicine, 5 ECTS – potentially increase to 6ECTS for HT26) and the generic track (Biomedicine - professional skills, 3 ECTS – potentially decrease to 2 ECTS for HT26). Revise syllabus accordingly. Review the requirements for achieving VG for each of these parts.

Responsible = Course Director

Implement prior to start of course HT26

Appendices:

Course survey HT25