

Course analysis (course evaluation)

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Course code 2QA345 | Course title Advanced human physiology research | Credits 7,5 |
| Semester HT24 | Period 241007-241110 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Course coordinator Rodrigo Fernandez-Gonzalo | Examiner Anna Wiik |
| Teacher in charge of component | Other participating teachers Tommy Lundberg, Gustav Jörnåker, Helene Rundqvist, Helena Wallin, Håkan Rundqvist, Lisa Eriksson |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Number of registered students during the three week check 8 | Number approved on the last course date 8 | Response frequency course valuation survey 31,58 |
|---|---|--|

Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation)

Email contact with the course coordinator and/or the other teachers, as well as face-to-face discussion during the lectures and seminars

Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students

Open course web and Canvas

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: 200115

The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 200115

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

Based on our previous experience with this course in the Master of Translational Physiology and Pharmacology, we have condensed the teaching activities in the course so that students do not have to spend more days than necessary on campus, allowing more time for self-study and project preparation. We gave students two opportunities to present and discuss their ideas for the various mandatory assignments, and they received real-time feedback on their plans. This was introduced as some students perceived some ambiguity in relation to their assignments in the past. I must say that this has significantly improved the quality of the assignments that students have submitted this year.

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

Overall, the course was perceived as very good and valuable. Most students state that they have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course (4.0), and that they have achieved all the ILOs of the course (4.3). There was a perception that there was a common theme running throughout the course (4.3), and that the course has promoted scientific way of thinking (4.5). The students perceived that the teachers were open to new ideas and approaches (4.3), and that the pedagogical approach used has stimulated their learning (4.2). The students think that their previous knowledge seemed to be sufficient for the course (4.3), and that the feedback received has been very important to develop their skills in this topic (4.7). The students also believe that the course improved their perception on ethical issues when working with human research subjects (4.7). Importantly, the students perceived that it was very clear what was expected from them during the course (4.7), and that they could find the relevant information when needed (4.3).

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

Strengths of the course: In the survey, emails and personal conversations, students highlighted the commitment of the teaching staff as one of the greatest strengths of the course. They appreciated the energy that the teaching team put into all lectures and the variety in the teaching methods we used. Some students stated that the course was coherent and well thought out. I am very pleased with the performance of all the students. They submitted very good projects and were able to defend and discuss almost all the details of the assignment, which indicates that they put a lot of time and thought into it. The students also mentioned that some of the compulsory seminars, such as the seminar "Evaluation of published CT protocols", and the practical demonstrations were very good.

Weaknesses of the course: We received comments on some content overlaps with previous courses. This cannot be completely avoided as we need to ensure that this content is understood in the context of human physiology research. To compensate for this, we try to provide examples and content that really relate to human physiology research (although the general components may also apply to drug trials, for example).

4. Other views

n/a

5. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

This is the first time we have offered this course as freestanding course, and we feel that the quality is very good, making the students very engaged with their own education. As mentioned earlier, we offer a compulsory seminar (final project) and an optional workshop (SOP) in which students presented their ideas for the assignments and two teachers gave real-time feedback

based on the grading criteria for each assignment. This significantly improves the quality of work and aligned teacher and student expectations.

The course ran alongside a master's course. This was a challenge at the beginning, but in the end we had a great group of mixed students who collaborated with each other and increased the amount and quality of discussion during the various events in the course.

We do not plan major changes to the course, given the positive feedback and general perception by both teachers and students.

Appendices: