



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Department of Chemistry
Lund University

Evaluation summary for KEMM13 Advanced Biochemistry 15 hp VT2019

Course leader: Urban Johanson

Other teachers: Susanna Horsefield, Veronika Nesverova, Dev Thacker, Carl Johan Hagströmer

Guest lecturers: Henrik Stålbrand, Ingemar André

Number of students: 10, whereof 1 quitting late in the course.

Grades after 2nd exam: 1 (registered VT2018) not passed (UK), 6 passed (G), 3 passed with honours (VG).

Evaluation:

I. Summary of course evaluations

Mid-course evaluation: Reported in the PM "Notes from mid-course evaluation meeting KEMM13 2019-04-26" made available for the students via L@L. In brief, it was concluded that overall the course is working fine. Suggested changes: the schedule should contain more detailed information and be revised for the lectures (UJ) which exceeded the scheduled time. For the practicals, specific improvements were suggested to better prepare the students for the primer design and to clarify the lab instructions further.

Survey&Report: 7 answers of 10 respondents (70%). The categories were rated from 1 (very bad) up to 5 (very good) and opportunity to add free text was provided on each question. The general impression of the course is very good (average 4.4), which coincides with the five-year-average (4.4). Teachers and Exam are the most appreciated categories (average 4.6 and 4.4, respectively), the former is slightly lower rated than the corresponding five-year-average (4.7; the latter has not been rated in the survey before). The Practical also received a high rating (4.3; five-year-average 4.6), whereas the two categories Exercises and Lectures received the lowest rating (3.3 and 3.7, respectively; five-year-averages, both 3.8). For Exercises this is the lowest rating recorded, and the spread in the rating is wider than for other categories. For Lectures there is a slight improvement compared to last year (3.6) and only one respondent deviates from an otherwise unanimous rating (4) by giving a lower rating (2). The self-estimated workload is 2.7, which is slightly better than the five-year-average (2.5) and corresponds to an average of >30 h/week.



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Department of Chemistry
Lund University

The free text answers specified that the students particularly liked the practicals and the lectures by SH with quizzes, whereas memorizing topology for too many proteins and lack of detailed reading instructions were disliked. A clearer structure in powerpoints made by UJ, more time for primer design and for the planning of LAB2, as well as examples of plans were wished for.

II. Comments by teaching team

Overall the course is working fine but there is always room for improvements. Most seriously, a suspected case of plagiarism was reported to the Vice-Chancellor. Measures should be taken to avoid that this is repeated in the future. In the survey, exercises have the lowest rating, but it is not clear exactly which part that should be improved. Potentially problem 2 could be developed further. In LAB1 there was some confusion regarding the prediction of the sizes of PCR products. Also the AP assay in this lab might not have worked properly for all groups. In contrast, the primer design for LAB2 worked fine and was less stressful this year, a partially due to the lower number of students. However, currently students receive relatively little feedback on their posters and how they can be improved.

III. Evaluation of implemented changes of the course

The following changes have been implemented this year:

- 1) The document Code of conduct was available at Live@Lund. However, this is not sufficient, we should go through the content of this document at the introduction.
- 2) The classification of membrane proteins was provided as a power point to clarify the logic structure in the lectures on membrane proteins and lectures by UJ were revised. However, more time and clearer structure is still required.
- 3) Problem 2 was revised, but it may not have found its final form yet.
- 4) A specific question about the exam was added in the evaluation and revealed that current form is highly rated.
- 5) In response to the confusion regarding size of PCR products in LAB1, a new document regarding the constructions of plasmids was added at Live@Lund. It seems to have clarified the situation.

IV. Suggested changes

- At the introduction, go through the document Code of conduct, step by step, emphasize that plagiarism is not tolerated in lab reports.
- Use Urkund to analyse lab reports.
- Add more time in schedule and revise lectures further to provide a clearer structure (UJ).
- Consider using quizzes and red/green cards in lectures (UJ).



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Department of Chemistry
Lund University

- Consider further revision/change of Problem 2.
- Add specific questions in electronic evaluation on: Schedule, Course organization, Guest lectures. Divide the question on Exercises into several questions to narrow down where the largest potential for improvements are.
- Add free-text option in evaluation to allow students to give advices to next generation of students on how to succeed on the course.
- Include a positive control for each lab group for the AP assay in LAB1 and revise the instructions.
- Explain how plasmids pNHW and pPHOA were constructed before LAB1.
- Add the exact time for the deadline for the LAB1 report and the time for the midcourse evaluation in the schedule.
- Set aside time in the schedule for planning of LAB2.
- Provide a poster from a previous year that includes a more detailed planning of the project to facilitate the planning in LAB2.
- Appoint a committee that gives specific feedback on each poster.

2019-07-05, summary compiled by Urban Johanson

Sammanställningen mailas till utbildningsadministratör Annelie Raimer:
annelie.raimer@kc.lu.se