

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 1BI039	Course title Chemical Biology	Credits 8hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT26	Period April 28 – June 7, 2026	
Course coordinator Bernhard Lohkamp		Examiner Bernhard Lohkamp
Teacher in charge of component		Other participating teachers various
Number of registered students during the three week check 66	Number approved on the last course date 51	Response frequency course valuation survey 57.6%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Regular contact with course representatives; course council meetings, one after the exam and one after exam results and survey results.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Survey (without comments) published on the kursweb page (Drupal). Discussed survey in the course council. Comments and resulting changes etc will be presented at the start of the new course.		

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 the following date: **01/07/26**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: **01/07/26**

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

The inhibitor lab manual was revised and clarified. The content of the corresponding lab report was further reduced with given expected length for sections. A data analysis and visualisation seminar, incl. a preparatory quiz, was introduced to support students in analysing their obtained data.

The computer lab and associated manual were completely restructured to improve the workflow and reduce the workload. The report was divided into 2 parts, one on familiarisation with the computer programme and protein structures in general, and a second to analyse ligand binding (unchanged from the previous year, except adjusted to ChimeraX).

Videos quizzes for the biophysical methods were made mandatory to ensure everyone acquired the relevant knowledge.

The format of the final exam was changed and split between a MCQ part and an essay part. All lab reports were scheduled to be returned before the exam to provide students with relevant feedback.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations 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 students generally expressed a positive view of the course, with most indicating that the course as a whole was good. The course builds effectively on prior knowledge from earlier courses which supports students' learning. The course organisation and laboratory components were well received.

However, some students missed a red thread through the course and perceived the content as too much and detailed. Some course parts were challenging and perceived too time consuming.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course is appreciated by students in terms of teaching staff, topics, and overall content. The integration of previously acquired knowledge, esp. chemistry, is a strength and contributes to the learning experience.

The computer lab was well received and considered highly instructive, although demanding for some students. The drug discovery components and the overall variety of teaching formats (lectures, seminars, computer-based work, and laboratory sessions) were perceived as engaging and relevant.

The inhibitor lab appears particularly interesting due to its connection to real research. The data analysis and visualisation seminar supported students in understanding their own data interpretation and presentation.

Overall, the adjusted examination was considered relevant and aligned with the course content by the majority of students.

Weaknesses of the course:

The overall workload of the course was perceived as high. Some students found the assignments (e.g. data quiz and reports) demanding, and some parts of the course were considered content-heavy, often with too many (or long) lectures and/or too detailed and specialised material.

For some students the computer lab challenging and time-consuming. Clearer instructions, more introduction to ChimeraX, and more explicit guidance for report preparation should be provided.

Lab reports were perceived as demanding, and feedback was sometimes inconsistent in both quality and timing. Additionally, often grade justifications for reports were lacking or unclear.

Some lecture content appears AI generated and is wrong.

Sometimes the course lacks some coherence and clarity on content and connection between different parts. The lack of an appropriate textbook amplifies the sometimes apparent fragmentation.

3. Other views

Additional points raised in course council meetings: mandatory assignments should be clearly labelled in Canvas.

Due to several holidays during the course's allocated time, scheduling is always challenging resulting several compromises (in some years like this even more).

4. 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 course seems overall functioning well and is appreciated by students. The inhibitor lab, computer lab, and drug discovery parts are especially valued. However, the coherence and clarity of the course remained somewhat unclear and fragmented.

- review the overarching course structure and maybe rather start from "Chemical Biology" to then dive into the different parts of the course. This can be helped with the integration of a recommended textbook to better define content, structure, and learning objectives (BLo, P. Arvidsson, M. Haraldsson),

- review and reduce content and/or level of detail where appropriate and shift some emphasis from methodological detail towards functional understanding and application which potentially frees up some time in lectures too to be used in discussions (BLo),

- review of the data analysis seminar with respect to scheduling and mandatory preparatory quiz (BLo),

- add some extra support for the MS analysis, e.g. application in lecture, inclusion into the data analysis seminar (BLo, A. Leppert),
- attempt to distribute workload better across the course and ensure feedback for reports is obtained before the final exam; add a compulsory grade justification comment in Canvas – if possible (BLo),
- review the “new” computer lab section: clarify report instructions esp. regarding figures; give more extended introduction to ChimeraX, e.g. in the introduction to molecular graphics lecture, in the computer lab sessions etc. (BLo & MEk),
- replace the 2nd project work meeting in person with an online session where a slide, figure, question should be presented (B. Lemmens & BLo),
- review content of inhibitor lab report; consider reducing the content background/introduction and M&M even more (and clarify) whilst allowing some more discussion; clarify which MS spectra have to be analysed to what detail (BLo, F. Massai & H.Axelsson),
- ensure that AI generated lecture note content is accurate (lecturers),
- label all mandatory assignments in Canvas (BLo),
- add an exam review session after the final exam to discuss the exam and expected answers (BLo).

Appendices:

Survey