Course analysis

Course code	Course title	Credits
4BI135	Degree project Biomedicine	30
Semester (VT/HT-yr) VT26	**Dates** 2026-01-19 to 2026-06-04	

Course Director	Examiner
Andreas Lennartsson	Andreas Lennartsson
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course All individual supervisor (60) was in charge of their supervision.	**Other participating teachers** 60 evaluating teachers1 that evaluated the written report and 4 evaluating teachers2 (Ivan Nalvarte, Vanessa Lundin, Peter Svensson and Victoria Menéndez Benito) that evaluated the oral presentations.

Number of registered students at the 3-week check	Number passed at final course day	Response frequency course valuation survey
60	60	19
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) Discussion after all oral presentations at the examination day.		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students At the introduction meeting for the following year students, I presented last years feed back and improvements.		

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
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2026-11

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

One main improvement was im plemented:
Feed-back session between the supervisors and students were better organized and standardized

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.)

A large majority of the students agreed to a large and very large extent that they have been included and respected during the course. The course structure was relevant to reach the ILOs and that the course was build on knowledge from previous courses. Most students thinks that feed-back from supervisors and peers supported their learning, even if there was a spread in the answers. All (responding) students think that the work load was appropriate. The overall opinion (92%) agree on that of the course was good.

Comments from the free text:
The students wish earlier access to Canvas to get the information documents for the course.
Some students wish that the requirements and expectations on the students are better communicated and that the communication on Canvas and course organizor can be improved. The students appreciate and value the feedback from my evaluating teachers1 for the written report.

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

Strengths of the course:

The main strength of the course is that the students can independent select project based on their own interest. A majority of the students are very satisfied.

Weaknesses of the course:

The learning athmosphere and quality of supervision is depent on the host lab and difficult to monitor.

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.)

Overall is it a well functioning course, but improvements can always be made. For the course 2027 **A)** A generall Canvas page that contains information for all three project courses has been constructed and made avalible. **B)** The assessment criteria will be improved to clarify the requirements and expectations on the students. The assessment criteria will also be better communicated with the students.

Appendices:

For the full evaluation, see link below.
https://survey.ki.se/Report/61XblcMYbGP