Notes from mid-course evaluation meeting KEMM13 2019-04-26

Urban Johanson, 2019-04-26
Present:
Student representatives: Veronika Tolevska, Yasmin Lozansson
Course leader: Urban Johanson

Overall the course is working fine and no issues that called for immediate action were identified. The atmosphere is open and respectful. Each of the learning activities and the course literature were discussed.

1. Overall organization and schedule:
   Fine, no major complaints.
   Nevertheless, the time for the midcourse evaluation meeting should be set in the schedule so that the short notice this year is avoided in the future. This will make it easier for student to convey any feedback to their representatives.
   The exact time for the deadline for handing in the report on LAB1 should be noted in the schedule.

2. Lectures:
   In general, the lectures are well structured. Susanna's quizzes with the red and green cards were much appreciated. The next time the course is running, the schedule will be revised so that Urban's lectures are not behind, or exceeding the times given in the schedule.
   The reading list for the textbook is not very detailed on purpose to train the students to find the relevant information based on the lectures. The drawback of this is that it's takes longer time and it's harder to prepare before the lectures, or to catch up if you have been ill.

3. Problem (exercises):
   At this time in the course only Problem 1 has been completed. This was found to be instructive and especially the concluding summary was appreciated.

4. Practicals/Labs:
   The overviews of the practical given each day by Veronika were very good and much appreciated. There was some confusion on how to calculate the expected sizes of the different PCR products generated in LAB1. In response to this a new document *g2) Construction of pNHW and pPHOA* was created and uploaded at Live@Lund, and this was simplifying the finding of binding sites for the primers and helpful for the calculations of PCR products. In the alkaline phosphatase assay, it should be noted in the instructions that it is only the upper phase (avoiding the chloroform and cell debris in the bottom phase) that should be transferred to a cuvette to measure A_{550} and A_{420}.
   An early computer exercise on primer design before LAB1 was suggested by course representatives to allow students to get better acquainted with the procedure for how to plan for construction, expression and detection of a membrane protein (fusions of NuoH and PhoA). This would not only result in a better understanding of the groundwork for LAB1, but also serve as a guidance for how to think when designing primers for amplification, cloning and overexpression of the Gene-of-interest in LAB2. An alternative, requiring less teaching resources, may be to incorporate this information (g2) Construction of pNHW and pPHOA) into one of the LAB1 related lectures (*Fusion protein techniques*).

5. Literature:
   The textbook was not so useful on its own, and the relevant information for a particular lecture was scattered which made it hard to prepare or catch up, see above point 2.
   The articles, especially the ones related to LAB1 were found to be very useful.

6. Evaluation:
   See point above, include the midcourse evaluation meeting in the schedule.
   There will an individual anonymous evaluation of the course at the end of the course. If there are any immediate issues that needs to be solved, students are welcome to contact the course leader directly, or via the student representatives if anonymity is preferred.

Notes approved by student representatives on KEMM13 2019-05-04