

## Course analysis (course evaluation)

<b>Course code</b> 4BI107	<b>Course title</b> Frontiers in Biomedicine	<b>Credits</b> 10.5
<b>Semester (VT/HT-yr)</b> HT21	<b>Dates</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> August – 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	

<b>Course Director</b> Rachel Fisher	<b>Examiner</b> Rachel Fisher
<b>Teachers in charge of different parts of the course</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circulation, Metabolism and Endocrinology: Jurga Laucinkiene + Ljubica Matic</li> <li>• Cell Biology, Development and Regeneration: Matti Nikkola, Karolina Kublickiene + Lena Ström</li> <li>• Immunology and Infection: Benedict Chambers</li> <li>• Neuroscience: Fredrik Piehl, Maria Ankarcrona + Lennart Brodin</li> <li>• Tumour Biology: Margareta Wilhelm</li> <li>• Course Administrator: Mari Liljefors</li> </ul>	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Within each “track” there were a number of different teachers with expertise in the different topics that were covered.  In addition, the course contained a “generic track” with three focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic writing: Gabrielle Ekman</li> <li>• Rhetoric: Peter Lind</li> <li>• Ethics: Niklas Juth</li> </ul>

<b>Number of registered students at the 3-week check</b> 44	<b>Number passed at final course day</b> 41 (3 students were required to submit revisions of an assignment)	<b>Response frequency course valuation survey</b> 75%
<b>Other methods for student influence</b> (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) A course council, open to all students, was held close to the end of the course (8 <sup>th</sup> October). The meeting was held in Zoom and teachers in charge of the five tracks were also invited to participate. The majority of the students participated in the course council. Minutes were taken (by a student representative) and placed on Canvas. During the course, students were encouraged to give feedback directly to the course director or track leaders. It was also possible to post feedback on Canvas. Contact with the course administrator was also encouraged.		
<b>Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students</b> 2021-11-11 (survey placed on courses webpages in both Canvas and Drupal)		

### Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also to the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 2022-03-15  
 The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2022-03-15

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

This was the first time the course ran so the entire contents were new.

### 2. Brief summary of the students' evaluation 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.)*

In general, the students were satisfied with the course and appreciated the design that provided a good introduction to KI, the programme and to one another. Although the course was considered to be challenging, this was generally viewed in a positive light and the course was deemed to be rewarding. However, the design of the course and the multiple assignments was found stressful at times. The course was viewed to have promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning

### **3. The Course Director's reflections on the implementation and results of the course**

#### ***Strengths of the course:***

- A broad introduction to research and researchers at KI, achieved through lectures, journal clubs, tasks/assignments and research project fairs
- Research project fairs providing opportunities for students and researchers to come in to contact with one another and for the students to find potential labs in which to perform their research projects (beneficial for students and researchers alike)
- Generic track providing training in scientific writing, ethics and rhetoric
- Multiple opportunities to give oral presentations and to learn from this (combined with the rhetoric part of the generic track)
- Group work providing multiple opportunities for students to get to know one another (important since the first course in the programme)
- A range of different assignments (all with assessment criteria)
- A course that was challenging, but rewarding
- The emphasis on critical thinking and analysis
- Excellent track organisers + engaged and enthusiastic teachers
- Clear organisation of the course web on Canvas providing access to information and course material, combined with excellent course administration

#### ***Weaknesses of the course:***

- The course as a whole and the component tracks were not introduced clearly enough, hence there was lack of clarity regarding design/organisation/expectations
- Too intensive at times with short deadlines
- Sometimes too many lectures/day, and some lectures too long
- Organisation of the research project fair – not easy to get an overview of the participating labs and where to find them at the fair
- Uneven “depth” in different tracks: “state-of-the-art” generally appreciated, but some parts were too basic/general
- Unclear organisation regarding assignment of students to journal clubs – sometimes students were assigned and sometimes they could choose, but the process by which they could choose was unclear/confusing

### **3. Other views**

The course ran well given that it was completely new! Both teachers and students enjoyed the format, allowing for extensive interaction and discussion. In general, teachers were very impressed by the performance of the students. The goal to develop a course that promoted critical thinking and served as an introduction to KI and the Master's Programme in Biomedicine appears to have been achieved. However, there are naturally areas to improve, but many of them pertain to communication and how information is transferred, which should be able to be addressed in HT22.



#### **4. Course Director's conclusions and any suggestions for changes**

*(If changes are suggested, state who is responsible for implementing them and provide a schedule.)*

- Extend introduction to the course clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc.  
Responsible = Course Director  
Implement in first two days of the course in HT22
- Include introduction to each of the tracks clarifying the organisation, goals, expectations etc  
Responsible = Track leaders  
Implement at start of each track block in HT22
- Clarify organisation of the generic track and the topics for the assignments  
Responsible = Course Director  
Implement in first two days of the course in HT22 and in connection with each part of the generic track
- Standardise/clarify access to journal clubs across the tracks  
Responsible = Course Director/track leaders/course administrator  
Implement HT22
- Restrict length of lectures to 30-40 minutes  
Responsible = Track leaders (to inform lecturers and ensure timing is adhered to)  
Implement HT22
- Structure research project fairs so that students can orient themselves more easily  
Responsible = Course Director/course administrator  
Implement HT22

#### **Appendices:**

Course survey with the students' comments