

Course analysis (course evaluation)

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Course code 4BI088 | Course title Junior Research Project | Credits 9hp |
| Semester (spring/autumn) VT-21 | Period April 27 - June 6, 2021 | |
| 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 34 | Number approved on the last course date 34 | Response frequency course valuation survey 88% |
| 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). 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: **24/06/21**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: **24/06/21**

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 revised and hopefully improved. 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.

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 or omitted since there is an oral assessment session. Furthermore, more (detailed) information could be given to the students esp. with respect to the assessment session as well as supervisors and examiners.

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 acquainted with research in general and research groups at KI in particular. Very relevant assessment using discussion session.

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 not both). Potentially too many assessments for the short duration.

3. Other views

A centralised data base for potential project (or supervisors) was suggested by students esp. in sight of the short duration.

Several instructions, deadlines etc appeared to some students unclear and confusing. Once known this was clarified as much as possible during the course, however many students did not reach out. Adjustments due to the Covid-19 pandemic may have caused issues.

Covid-19 adjustments were few since there is only a meeting (online) with students in the beginning and the assessment session (online). The lab/project work was performed on campus (unless theoretical).

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.)

This was the last time the JRP course was given since there will be a new curriculum in the Master's Programme for Biomedicine. However, if the course would be continued and/or elements would be implemented in new courses the following could be taken into consideration.

The format of the project summary (as well as the project plan) will be outlined in more detail although it should allow some freedom and not be too restrictive. At the same time, it will be considered to increase the number of words (BLo). The "half time" control with supervisor and students could be done earlier (1/3 of the course) 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). The supervisors and their role e.g. in assessment etc. will be defined clearly together with instructions about the course, assessment, influence on writing etc. This shall be confirmed in a form of contract about the supervision (BLo).

Note: the examination session in form of a round-the-table discussion should not be changed since this is a deliberate different form of examination and hence different to previously used ones and a very real situation. Sadly, this is very often misunderstood by the students (and even some examiners). New ways (vocabulary, descriptions) need to be found to clarify this for all involved since the current form despite all efforts does not seem to work.

Appendices:

Survey