

Report - BB2560 - 2024-05-02

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

Lauren McKee, mckee@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

An LEQ form was sent out to all students at the end of the course, and they were given six weeks to complete it, so they could choose to wait until they had received their final grade before filling out the evaluation form. 39% of students submitted the evaluation form. The kursenkät summary shows a breakdown of survey results by gender, (dis)ability, and international status.

During the course, there were multiple informal sessions where students were asked to give spontaneous feedback of the experience. In particular this was done during new-to-the-course activities such as the peer review sessions coordinated by Lauren, where a straw poll was taken of how many students found the session useful and how many had learned something new.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

No specific feedback meetings were arranged this year. We were informed at the beginning of the course that a 'kursnämnd' of students had formed to give us feedback, and we thought they would contact us to discuss the course, but we did not hear from them. So I am relying on the evaluation form and the results of in-class requests for feedback for this course analysis exercise.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

We provide five thematic modules that give knowledge on the theory and applications of meta-omic sequencing as a tool to study complex microbial communities. Within each theme there are two lectures and one exercise that requires group work, article reading and discussion, and the critical evaluation of published work. We offer a lab project, which forms the TEN1 graded course assessment, wherein students propose and then perform a mini research project, sampling and sequencing a microbial ecosystem. New for 2024 was a peer review element in the TEN1 assessment, which included two new workshops hosted by Lauren.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

In general yes, the workload is appropriate, according to the student responses to the course evaluation. Two students this year reported spending more than 41 hours per week on this course, which is far beyond the typical: everyone else reported 3-23 hours per week, with a reasonable average and median value. These two outliers stated in written responses that they had a particular interest in learning deeply about the topics offered by this course, and so I do not believe they felt pressured to work such long hours. See these student responses below:

"It was a nice course, I needed it and needed to really have the skills from it. That is why I have put more effort"

"The course required reading papers and other extra information, I engaged more than the scheduled hours as the course content was new to me, I was having a background in microbiology but not in metagenomics specifically"

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

All but two students submitted the TEN1 lab report. One submitted late and, as had been fore-warned, therefore failed the course, and one student did not submit an assignment. The proportion of grades was as follows: 6 A grades, 17 B grades, 13 C grades, 3 D grades, 2 E grades, one F grade. The grading curve this year is highly similar to previous course offerings, so we are satisfied that we have a consistent approach in grading the lab reports, as well as an overall high level of achievement from our students.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The evaluation shows a mix of positive and critical feedback but overall gives a very favourable impression of the student experience. The lab project is highlighted as being a key learning experience, as well as being fun and motivating as it involves creativity as well as critical /analytical thinking. There are some comments that we can be more transparent with the grading and which events are mandatory or not.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Overall very positive reception, especially to the lab report and the "Intro to Peer Review" workshop. The actual peer review of lab reports was appreciated by almost all survey respondents, although some mentioned that they would have liked to be able to resubmit their lab reports after receiving peer feedback.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

We are happy that the course continues to be effective and appreciated by the majority of our students. We are also glad to have received some specific actionable feedback in the course evaluation this year, regarding transparency in the selection of projects.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

For the first time this year, we see slightly lower scores from female students than for male students, which reverses the usual trend. Although I emphasise that scores for the course for both genders were overall high, showing a good degree of satisfaction. This difference is clearest when the students were asked to dis/agree with the following four statements:

- The assessment on the course was fair and honest
 - I could practice and receive feedback without being graded
 - The course activities enabled me to learn in different ways
 - I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others
- We will reflect on the possible causes of these gender differences!

There were no noticeable differences in evaluation scores between inter/national students or dis/abled students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

Next year, we will allow students to revise and resubmit their lab reports after receiving peer feedback. We will also reflect on the deadline for the lab report, since some students reported it was too early this year. However, that might be ok if they get a chance to resubmit - we will reflect on this in a teachers meeting. We will also aim to be clearer and more transparent in how the lab reports are graded - despite multiple avenues of communication to explain the process, the course evaluation suggests that some students were still uncertain as to how the peer review affected their final grade.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

We had some issues this year with the choice of research project, which was in part to analyse samples for a start-up company founded by a student on the course. In future years we must be much more careful about the choice of project, and guide the student discussion session on project choices.
