

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 1BI040	Course title Tissue Biology	Credits 4hp
Semester (VT/HT-yr) HT-25	Dates 18 th September – October 6 th , 2025	

Course Director Malgorzata Parniewska	Examiner Sara Windahl
Teachers in charge of different parts of the course Timea Szekerczes – responsible for the lab project	Other participating teachers Malgorzata Parniewska, Ahmed Osman, Laszlo Szekely, Evelina Tidholm Qvist

Number of registered students at the 3-week check 80 (1 student registered from last year's course but did not participate)	Number passed at final course day 70	Response frequency course valuation survey 30.00%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to the final course valuation/survey) Course council meeting on 28.10.2025		
Feedback reporting of the course evaluation results to the students The results of the course evaluation were uploaded to Canvas and in the open course pages on October 21 st , 2025.		

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: 2025-12-22
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2025-12-22

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

- The epithelial tissues lecture has taken place onsite
- The lecture content has been revised to minimize repetition
- All video lectures have been subtitled

Additional changes based on judgement from course director

- New lecturers – dr Ahmed Osman, dr Laszlo Szekely
- New lecture: Multiplex staining techniques for tissues
- Introduction to the lab project 1 day earlier
- Tour of the clinic took place (clinic was unable to organise in previous year)

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.)

Most of the students who responded to the survey felt that the course as a whole was of good quality and was designed to provide opportunities for active learning. The majority of students reported feeling included and respected during the course. Most students also felt that the workload was reasonable and that the examination was relevant in relation to the intended learning outcomes.

Strengths:

Students found the course to be interesting and particularly appreciated the microscopy sessions and the laboratory project in LabBuddy. They also felt that the seminars were effective for revising the course material. The course director was perceived as supportive and open to feedback.

Suggestions for improvement:

Students felt that the lecture on Epithelial tissues would benefit from a clearer structure. They also noted that the annotations in Aiforia could be improved by ensuring that all structures mentioned in the videos are annotated. Some students felt that the microscopy videos would be more effective if conducted onsite. In addition, some students indicated that LabBuddy would benefit from clearer instructions. A few students felt that the exam questions were sometimes too in-depth or overly detailed, and expressed that access to more recent past exams would be valuable.

Summary from “Course evaluation council”**Overall opinion of the course**

The students thought that the course was overall good.

Schedule

The students thought that the schedule was overall good but not enough time was allocated to watch the video lectures. This was in particular the case for the Connective tissues lecture.

Lectures

The students thought that the Connective tissues video lecture was very detailed and contained a lot of information. It would have been appreciated to highlight additional information outside of the learning outcomes. An actual onsite lecture would have been preferred. The students thought that some concepts in the Staining techniques for tissues lecture and the Advanced tissue analysis lecture were not explained in great detail.

Seminars

The seminars were good but two separate rooms would have been better, considering the number of students.

Lab project and calculation seminar

The Lab project was good. It would have been appreciated to add more introduction on how to use Labbuddy.

Histology part

The histology part was thought to be overall OK. The students would appreciate all annotations in Aiforia to be in English.

The tour of the clinic

The tour of the clinic was appreciated.

Exam

The students thought that some of the required content from the lecture part seemed too detailed. The histology part of the exam was good and representative of the learning outcomes. The students would appreciate more recent past exams.

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

Strengths of the course:

This course was in general considered highly interesting. Students appreciate in particular the use of Aiforia for microscopy tissue exploration and Labbudy for learning the IHC workflow.

Weaknesses of the course:

This course is considered to be high content considering the amount of hp points. Some lectures could benefit from a better structure and/or being delivered onsite.

3. Other views

Students showed great interest in the tour of the clinic.

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.)

- Some lectures may be changed from online to onsite
- Lectures may be reviewed and revised regarding their structure
- More recent past exams will be shared
- Aiforia annotations will be revised
- Instructions on how to use Labbudy will be revised

Appendices:

Course survey Tissue Biology HT25