



## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 1BI037	<b>Course title</b> Cell, Stem Cell and Developmental Biology	<b>Credits</b> 12 HP
<b>Semester (VT/HT-yr)</b> HT2024	<b>Dates</b> Nov 17 <sup>th</sup> 2025 to Jan 16 <sup>th</sup> 2026	

<b>Course Director</b> Matthew Kirkham (MK)	<b>Examiner</b> Lena Ström
<b>Teachers in charge of different parts of the course</b> <b>Main lab teachers:</b> -Labs: Matthew Kirkham <b>Main CCT teachers:</b> Part 1: KIB staff Part 2: MK Part 3: Anna M Borgström (Writing support)	<b>Other participating teachers</b>

<b>Number of registered students at the 3-week check: 71</b>	<b>Number passed at final course day: 55</b>	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey: 54%</b>
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> (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		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students</b> Course analysis is uploaded on to course website. Emailed to the course representatives		

### 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: June 1<sup>st</sup> 2025  
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: June 1<sup>st</sup> 2025

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

- Simplify the structure of the Canvas page for easier navigation.
- Seminar on how generative AI can be used to provide support (scaffold) to learning
- Updated lab report information and lectures, emphasizing the connection between data and results, and included additional theory on the T-test.

## **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 feedback from discussion with the student representatives and students*

### **Summary of students' student online survey**

In general, the students agreed that the course was good (mean score 5.6 out of 6). The survey also demonstrated that the students felt the feedback they received from their peers and teachers supported their learning (mean score 5 out of 6). Furthermore, most of the students felt to a large extent or very large extent that the course structure was good and provide them with opportunities for active learning (mean score 5.4 out of 6), the workload was reasonable (mean score 5.5 out of 56) and examination was relevant (mean score 5.4 out of 6).

### **Most relevant responses for student online survey on improvements**

#### *Strengths:*

-I specifically enjoyed the CCT part of this module, it was a great way to actively learn and feel closer to the career I'm preparing for instead of just attending lectures with loads of information. This tied in a great way with the purpose of the Laboratory part of the module, as the Lab Report was also aimed towards better scientific communication. All of the professors were nice, communicative and understanding

-Felt very included and welcome. I was encouraged to ask question and felt comfortable to do so.

-The content was very interesting, and all the lecturers were researchers in the topics being discussed and acted as a window into the research aspect of the theory content we were learning (by describing their research/explaining their experiences). Additionally, the course throughout had a focus on research (e.g. cell lineage tracing etc.). The CCT part of the course allowed for students to practice public speaking / presentation skills which are key in any field. However, it was a shame that not everyone engaged (because the activities were optional). The labs were very interesting and realistic (compared to modern day research; e.g. using assays one would use in a research lab).

#### *Improvements:*

- A more organized canvas page would help and also a key to the self studies would be nice, but the information could be found anyway.

- Outline of the course content. It was good that we could learn with previous exams what the questions would look like and what is expected from us to know. However, it would be good to have a course content page with bulletpoints with processes or keyterms we have to understand as the study guide only gave us chapters of the course literature.

-It will be better if more excise could be given with more seminars for answer-checking. Assigning locations for the self-study activities so students can sit together and work on the questions, and discuss in case they need. Perhaps the labs could be more structured/scheduled so there is less waiting around, although it is understandable that there are delays since there are more students than equipment.



### ***Most relevant feedback from Student reps***

- Lectures showed some inconsistencies, in the amount of details given. Students requested better alignment with the study guide, and a potential DNA-focused workshop later in the course in January.
- Canvas organization and assignment structure could be improved, along with a clearer and more structured study guide and an increase in seminar opportunities.
- Laboratory sessions were generally well received, especially Lab 1, but improvements were suggested for protocol clarity (e.g., dilution steps) and better scheduling/communication for microscope exams, including clear start times on Canvas.
- The CCT component was highly appreciated, particularly flash talks and overall structure; however, students requested more emphasis on scientific writing (including use of generative AI)
- Students expressed a wish for more feedback on lab reports.

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

#### ***Strengths of the course (what worked well)***

The course was a success. Students thought that for a very large extent that the lectures and Labs were good and all the teachers they encountered were excellent. This is reflected in the course survey with a high approval rating for the course. The attendance of the lectures was generally ok, but a little less than last year. But there was still a good pass rate of the exam. CCT part was very appreciated. In general, the improvements to the course worked well.

#### ***Weaknesses of the course (what could be improved)***

The canvas pages were modified somewhat from last year, but the students still would like to have a different structure that they feel would be easier for them to find the information. In general, the lab report worked well but there is still room for improvement. The students sometimes felt a disconnect between the textbook lectures and what they perceived they should know for the exam. Thus, it is important this year to update the course study guide.

### **3. Other views**

#### **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.)*

- Though improvements to canvas pages were made, there is still some work to do. Edit Canvas pages. (Matthew, September 2026)
- Add a small group discussion in January on cell biology topics including DNA (Matthew, September 2026)
- Add more on how generative AI can be used to provide support for scientific writing. Also investigate how to give more feedback to the students in the lab report. (Matthew, September 2026)
- Update course study guide. Check that this aligns with the lectures (Matthew, September 2026)