Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 1BI039	**Course title** Chemical Biology	**Credits** 8hp
Semester (spring/autumn) VT-20	**Period** April 30 – 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 **57**	**Number approved on the last course date** **50**	**Response frequency course valuation survey** **75%**
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) **Course committee meetings (1 during the course), on will follow after to discuss the survey and course analysis.**		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students **Survey (without comments) published on course Canvas page and will be published on the new kursweb page (Drupal). Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey. Will discuss survey with the course committee.**		

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

The lab manuals for both the computer and inhibitor (wet) lab have been revised to clarify several points. Several general points have been clarified e.g. the overall view of the course, that chemistry will be important, preparation for the workshop is important. A voluntary online pre-lab quiz was introduced for the wet lab. To be able to better include acquired knowledge the project work started later and was focused on the last week after the exam.

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.)

Note: general comments on the course due to the digital format will be summarised and discussed under Other views. The students are overall satisfied with the course from learning new, interesting information to the corresponding examination. Some feel thought there is too much content. It appears that there is still some underlying thread missing in the course which holds the different parts together, although this is less than before. The computer lab was generally perceived as interesting and fun. The group, project work was overall well received now, although instructions could be improved esp. considering the presentation.

Students were positive to it, learned a lot, appreciated the compulsory meetings, random presentation approach, group members/dynamics. However, there was feedback missing (Note: usually the assessor discusses the presentation with the group directly afterwards, but this was not done due to time constraints and digital format). The lab manuals appear still to require some more clarification here and there although the wet lab was not performed so it is difficult to comment there exactly. It appears the grading and feedback on the reports was uneven (depending on the teacher). Students would appreciate more informative text on lecture notes since there is no text book available as such and the notes are the main source of information for the exam.

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

Strengths of the course:

Teaching staff, topic, and content as such is very much appreciated by the students. The computer lab incl. introduction of Chimera appears well liked and teaches the students a lot. The project work focused in the end of the course allows students to apply the gained knowledge in their own work. Seminars are a good way of learning for the students.

Weaknesses of the course:

The lack of a (one!) suitable text book and "different" topics make it difficult to gel the course together and give it a common thread. Overall it appears that the course is very lecture based with little student active teaching. Some instructions need clarification and/or be extended e.g. for the project work.

3. Other views

Due to the covid-19 pandemic the course had to be changed to a digital online format on short notice. Lack of time resulted in a suboptimal implementation of digital teaching. However, overall the course adapted well to the digital format. Only the wet lab (1 day) had to be changed to a "dry" lab. Sadly, there was neither time nor appropriate external sources to supplement the lab with a video and/or simulation (e.g. Labster). Overall students appreciated the digital format of the course. (Rather) General advantages of digital teaching are mentioned to be e.g. less time for commuting, better time management and flexibility (recorded lectures), disadvantages are e.g. motivation and concentration difficulties. Specific issues during the course arose due to some technical issues, e.g. Canvas not showing the correct Zoom times and links but this was quickly solved with a separate schedule (thanks to the course committee for help), ONE Zoom links requiring a password (again this was resolved by sending out the password). Most students appear to prefer recorded lectures, however, not all lecturers were prepared to provide these. Due to time constraints the final examination was put together only in the last minute, even though the outline was discussed and presented to students before, some students adapted better to the digital format than others. Several would have appreciated more detailed information e.g. about the question types. Furthermore, the examination only in part managed to assess the students understanding of the topic. More time would have easily allowed for improvement. However, overall the result is comparable to that of previous courses.

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 lab compendia will be revised further; the wet lab to clarify the procedures (without being too explicit) and the computer lab to better separate instructions and questions to be answered (BLo). Additionally, the online pre-lab quizzes will be modified and made compulsory as to ensure preparation of the students which will result in a higher learning experience (BLo, teachers on wet lab). A lab report checklist (for teachers and students) could be introduced to allow more consistent grading and feedback on the reports (BLo). The course content will be discussed again as to see how to bring a common thread into it. In this context possible text books will be evaluated again to see if the course can be more comprehensive in this way (BLo, P. Arvidsson, M. Haraldsson). However, there is usually the problem that text books will either focus on Chemical Biology or Drug Discovery but not both, a new edition of a published text book may actually change this but is not published yet. Replacing some lecture with a seminar or lecture AND seminar will be considered esp. for longer lectures. Alternatively, some topics could be approached by TBL (BLo).

Appendices:

Survey