

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4BI088	Course title Junior Research Project	Credits 9hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT-20	Period April 27 - June 7, 2020	
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 25	Number approved on the last course date 24	Response frequency course valuation survey 96%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) N/A		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Survey (without comments) published on Canvas course page (will be on open Kursweb Drupal once established). Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey.		

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: **25/06/20**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: **25/06/20**

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

Since this is an elective course where students perform a research project in different laboratories, there is not much which can be influenced as such by the course responsible. However, course documentation and instructions were improved and the project summary is restricted by number of words now and not by pages. Other data bases with potential supervisors have been provided to give a wider suggestion of potential supervising laboratories. Note: the examination session in form of a round-the-table discussion will not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination different to previously used and a very real situation (this will be made even clearer in the beginning of the course). Furthermore, it encourages the discussion in the small examination groups.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the course was offered as a theoretical course as well. To fulfil the learning outcomes this is complemented with practical work credited from outside of the course. 13 out of total 26 students chose to do the alternative, theoretical course.

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 course appears to be appreciated by the students as it provides an opportunity to do research, learn new methods, research groups etc. They developed new skills and trained scientific thinking and reasoning.

A reoccurring comment is that the course appears to be too short which results in difficulties finding a hosting research group. The assessment of the work could be altered, the summary longer, and more information could be given to the students as well as examiners.

The theoretical alternative worked very well although it appears the workload could have been spread more evenly. Group sizes, interactions with teachers and topics were appropriate and fostered students interest and learning. Sometimes it was difficult though to get the digital presentations e.g. Journal Club, leading into discussions.

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

Strengths of the course:

The course allows the students to learn a new method in the context of a small research project. This is an excellent opportunity to learn (new) methods, get aquatinted with research in general and research groups at KI in particular. The theoretical alternative allowed students to learn about three different methods.

Weaknesses of the course:

The course is deemed too short, in terms of research project but mainly for finding suitable hosting laboratories (Note: students can return to the lab in the later Research project OR degree project but no both). The theoretical alternative was possibly too time demanding at times.

3. Other views

The same survey was conducted for all students, however, one section was specific for the theoretical alternative only ("How do you rate the different parts of the theoretical JRP course?). The questions from KI about (digital) teaching during the pandemic was open to everyone though.

One student is missing the practical part to complement the theoretical course alternative whilst another student, intermediate helping in a hospital to help with increasing demands due to the pandemic, is doing the project now.

There were suggestions to increase the summary text length.

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.)

More detailed descriptions about the project summary will be prepared for the next course. At the same time it will be considered to increase the number of words (BLo). The half time control with supervisor and students will be done earlier (after about 2 weeks) to allow earlier detection of potential issues (BLo). The course responsible will ensure that examiners are (better) aware of scope of the course as well as assessment criteria (BLo). Note: the examination session in form of a round-the-table discussion will not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination different to previously used and a very real situation (this will be made even clearer in the beginning of the course). Furthermore, it encourages the discussion in the small examination groups. This of course was not possible entirely in the digital setting this year.

Appendices:

Survey