

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 1BI036	Course title General and Organic Chemistry	Credits 12hp
Semester (spring/autumn) HT-21	Period September 22 - November 10, 2021	
Course coordinator Bernhard Lohkamp		Examiner Bernhard Lohkamp
Teacher in charge of component Michael Landreh		Other participating teachers various
Number of registered students during the three week check 51	Number approved on the last course date 36	Response frequency course valuation survey 80%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course committee meetings (3 time, 2 during the course, 1 after)		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Survey (without comments) published on the open course page. Whole survey sent to students who have participated in the survey. Discussed 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: **17/12/21**

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 17/12/21

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

Lab experiments and compendium were revised. Pre-lab quizzes could be repeated unlimited but needed to be passed before the lab sessions. The content of the course revised and reduced. Keep the intermediate test digital.

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.)

Students were engaged in critical thinking, enjoyed the laboratory work and mostly achieved the intended learning outcomes. The final exam was relevant to the learning outcomes and appropriate. Overall, the student-teacher communication was good, and students were responsible for their own learning. There are mixed opinions on the paths offered as blended learning (mixing of lectures and self-studies). Some students prefer to have more time between theory and practice to study themselves first

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

Strengths of the course:

Laboratory work is very much appreciated by the students and they enjoy not just the work but the connection between theory and practice. The pre-lab quizzes and video recordings of the experiments prepared the students better for the labs they performed. The delivery of the content with lectures (incl. some recorded ones) and associated seminars and self-study sessions is positive as the students continuously work on the subject and get the required help if necessary. Some students like to have these combined others do not which seems independent of teaching form (see above). Teachers were appreciated for their good interaction with students, feedback and support. The course is well structured and organised (incl. the Canvas pages).

Weaknesses of the course:

There was some overlap between content of lectures (no details given though). The content of the course is still perceived as too much, and some topics seem to feel out of context or disjoint. Some parts of the lab assessment can be difficult to judge, e.g. pre-lab discussions, and reports are not graded uniformly. The intermediate exam felt constrained with respect to the given time.

3. Other views

Some developmental work esp. with respect to practical laboratory session assessment had to be cut short and be postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic related increased workload.

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 pre-lab quizzes in Canvas worked well as the basis of lab preparation. However, this probably could result in a shorter pre-lab discussion which should then not be assessed any more with students being able to ask questions prior to the experimentation. The lab assessment incl. the report guidelines together with the expectation will be reviewed and condensed (BLo together with PN to give general report guidelines). The lab compendium will be revised to include more detail on the experiments esp. where steps are known to be difficult and/or result in mistakes (BLo). The content of the course will be reviewed to see where things can be removed, overlap can be avoided and where additional information is required. In particular the biomolecules section should rather emphasise and apply previous knowledge than add too much new. Additionally, teachers will be advised to focus on and highlight the course goal relevant parts (BLo). The intermediate test will be given more time (or fewer questions) (BLo). A workshop on academic writing should be included (again) (BLo with academic writing at KI). Self-study sessions will be better aligned with the corresponding lectures (BLo and resp. lecturers).

To increase the quality of teachers and teaching the importance of teaching (esp. deadlines for lab report corrections) should be lifted within the department (and KI). This is probably a long-term goal which will involve GUA, head of department as well as the course leader (and KI).

Appendices:

Survey