

Course analysis (course evaluation) – Biomedicine Bachelor Programme

Course code 1BI049	Course title Molecular Medicine - Oncology	Credits 15 ECTS
Semester Autumn	Period 2021-08-30 – 2021-10-31	

Course coordinator Nick Tobin (NT)	Examiner Nick Tobin (NT)
Teacher in charge of component Veronica Höiom (VH; PBLs) Ingemar Ernberg/ Galina Selivanova (IE, GS; Labs) Karl Oskar Ekvall (KOE; Biostatistics)	Other participating teachers A range of teachers, both from within and outside the Onk-Pat and MTC, including both clinicians and researchers (from both KI and KS).

Number of registered students during the three week check 52	Number approved on the last course date 52	Response frequency course valuation survey 5 (10%)*
--	--	---

Other methods for student influence

Students were repeatedly encouraged to provide ongoing feedback to the course coordinator (NT) who was present at all lectures (both physical and online) for the duration of the course. NT also sought opinions from the students before or after lectures. In addition, students were reminded that they could contact their class representatives with their views for discussion at a course council. The council was held towards the end of the course with class representatives.

**Note: KI changed the course survey software and we had problems getting it sent out. We tried to solve this with multiple phone calls and email correspondences, but in the end we ran out of time as we wanted to close the survey before the exam results came out. This was a once off event and will be much improved for next year but it meant that we only received 5 responses – not enough to provide a representative course valuation survey.*

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students

The 2020 course survey was made available on the course webpage (Canvas) and Drupal for the incoming 2021 students. At the course introductory presentation NT highlighted the strengths of the course and what changes that had been made to improve upon the perceived weaknesses - as taken from the 2020 survey and course council. The importance of receiving feedback on the course was also discussed along with demonstration of how feedback from previous years has helped to shaped the structure and content of course in its current form.

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: 9th Feb 2022

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on: 9th Feb 2022

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

- **Digital exam:** We switched to a digital exam for the first time this year using the BZ examination hall for the main exam and Widerströmska for the first repeat. We also trained in 6 new exam correctors in how to mark an exam in Inspira.
- **Lung cancer subject introduced:** We swapped in Lung cancer for lymphoma this year. This meant that we created 2 new lectures (lung cancer biology, lung cancer clinical aspects), a new PBLs based on lung cancer and a new lung cancer patient seminar case.
- **Lecturers:** New lecturers were introduced to the course to (i) Replace previous lecturers who had received low scores/poor feedback two years in a row and (ii) Introduce new subject material e.g. The microbiome and cancer
- **Lab 2 long term planning:** We had a brand-new Lab 2 this year which was run by Galina Selivanova and Lars-Gunnar Larsson. Galina will now take over responsibility for the labs in future from Ingemar Ernberg.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course

(Based on the course council)

- Similarly to previous course years, the feedback we received (mainly from the course council) was very positive. Students appreciated course organisation, were very happy with labs + PBLs contributing to their final result and really liked the use of the digital tool "Kahoot".
- Some constructive feedback was also given, this included: (i) Receiving the patient seminar "problem set" before the seminar so they where they can be better prepared for the questions; (ii) Some lecturers should be given constructive feedback about their presentation organisation and (iii) That the timing for the new Lab 2 should/could be changed to minimise wait times.

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

Strengths of the course:

- The course structure and organisation is very strong, this was mentioned by the students in the course council and verbally throughout the course
- We are very good at communicating with the students and they are left with the impression that we are engaged in their learning and understanding
- The connection to the oncology clinic with numerous lecturers and PBLs containing a clinical focus is central to the success of the course and highly appreciated by students
- The mix of lecturers, labs, PBLs and seminars has the combined effect of stimulating life-long learning. Often the students receive similar information but from clinical and research viewpoints, encouraging a deep understanding of the subject matter
- The digital elements we retained from during the pandemic have worked well and we will continue to use them e.g. Lab 3 is now completely digital

Weaknesses of the course:

- Some lectures can still be improved on, specifically by adding summary/ conclusions slides so it is clearer to the students what they are expected to know

- We were aware that the timing for Lab 2 was not optimal, these times were however “inherited” by those running the lab and this will be amended
- The patient seminars haven’t been working for a couple of years now, we need to change the preparation routines surrounding them, this is a suggestion noted below that will be rectified in 2022

4. Other views

The general atmosphere amongst the course leadership and organisation is one of positivity. The feedback we have received from students along with lecturers is both encouraging and motivating. We seem to have found a good balance between biological and clinical molecular oncology as well as between the number and structure of lectures, PBLs, seminars and labs. The long-term future of the labs on the course and in particular lab 2 has been secured through the hand-over of responsibility from Ingemar Ernberg to Galina Selivanova.

5. 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 overarching conclusion from the 2021 MM-O course should be one of positivity and optimism for future iterations on the basis of a strong and well organised foundation. The following changes will however be made with the aim of improving the course on the basis of student and teacher feedback:

- Lecturers will be reminded to add a summary slide on what subject matter is the most important from their presentation in order to make the lecture intended learning outcomes clearer. In addition, all lecturers will be given the feedback written by the students in the interest of continued improvement (Responsible: Nick Tobin)
- Lab 2 timing will be changed (Responsible: Nick Tobin and Galina Selivanova)
- The patient seminar questions will be sent out before the seminar in order to give the students more time to work through them.

Appendices:

N/A