COURSE REPORT – COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENTATION OF COURSE EVALUATION
The Faculty of Health and Society

The work with course evaluations and course reports constitutes a part of the faculty's quality assurance work in education at first-cycle and second-cycle education. The course report is a comprehensive documentation of the course evaluation and is an important instrument for the development of courses and programmes as well as for guaranteeing the students' influence on these. The course report takes into account the students' course evaluations, the teachers' views on the course's implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' achieved learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes of the course. Key figures, an analysis and a development plan for the course are also included in the course report.

It is of the utmost importance that students are given the opportunity to participate throughout the course evaluation process and that they make use of the opportunity to give constructive criticism. In this way, the results can serve as a relevant and specific foundation for improvement.

The structure for course evaluation is described in the "Course evaluation process for first- cycle and second-cycle education at Malmö University" (in Swedish *Kursvärderingsprocessen för utbildning på grundnivå och avancerad nivå vid Malmö universitet*), Ref. no. LED 1.3-2018/123) and in the "Routines for course evaluations and course reports at the Faculty of Health and Society" (in Swedish *Rutiner för kursvärderingar och kursrapporter vid Fakulteten för hälsa och samhälle*), Ref. no. LED 1.3-2016/187.

The course report compiled after each completed (full) course forms the basis for feedback to students and is followed up at quality dialogues at faculty- and university-wide level.

Background information (to be completed by the course administrator)

Course name		
Biointerfaces in Practice and Theory		
Course code	**Scope (credits)**	**Semester in which the course is completed**
BM811E	7,5	Autumn 2026
Specify the freestanding course or contract education (if the course has been completed within a programme, specify the name of the programme)		
Biomedical Surface Science, Master's Programme (Two-Year)		
Course coordinator		**Number of registered students**
Henrik Vinther Sörensen		12

Students' perspective (to be completed, if possible, by the course administrator or in some cases by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation/Momentary study climate assessment form for course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it has been carried out	
Number of students who have completed the formative course evaluation/momentary study climate assessment	**Percentage response rate** (the response rate should be indicated as a percentage when the formative course evaluation has been carried out via questionnaire, for example when conducting a momentary study climate assessment.)
Summative course evaluation (oral or questionnaire) and when it was completed	

COURSE REPORT – COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENTATION OF COURSE EVALUATION
The Faculty of Health and Society

questionnaire 2026-10-01 - 2026-10-09	
Number of students who have completed the summative course evaluation (please indicate both the number of registered and the number of active students on the course)	**Response rate as a percentage** (please indicate, without decimals, response rate both based on the number of registered students and the number of active students on the course)
10	83%

Feedback to students who have completed the course: describe how and when the feedback has been given

☐ By email (will be send automatically, with or without the course coordinator's comments, by the survey system 7 days after the survey is closed)
☐ By email (otherwise than above), how:
☒ In Canvas, how: As announcement
☐ Through a discussion in class, how:
☒ In other way, how: Meeting with student representative

Other comments about the feedback:

Feedback to new students on the upcoming course: describe how feedback will be implemented

☒ Presented at the start of the course, how: In introduction lecture
☐ In other way, how:

Teacher's perspective (to be completed by the course coordinator)

Results: Comments on the course implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' achieved learning outcomes in relation to the course intended learning outcomes are summarised here (incl. information regarding the result of the examination). Both success factors and problems are identified

The exam results show that all students have learned the most important intended learning goals, and many have learned almost all learning goals. Grades were on average high for a Master course, with 3/12 achieving an A and 2/12 a B, 2/12 a C, 1/11 a D and 2/12 an E. Just 2/12 failed the ordinary exam of which one was close to passing. Students showed ability to present complex topics in a seminar, write research reports, with clear ability to improve with teacher feedback. No learning goal showed general bad performance across the board, but rather those students that overall got lesser grades underperformed in different parts.

Analysis: Analysis based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations – both formative (if any), and summative evaluations. Produced in collaboration with the teachers involved in the course, alternatively by taking their views into account.

COURSE REPORT – COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENTATION OF COURSE EVALUATION
The Faculty of Health and Society

Evaluation scores were in general rather high, with scores lying between 3.6 and 5.2, which is considered good. Only part receiving weaker score is the workload (3.3), here the attendants answered very variably, difficult to interpret this as most also spend less than 40 hours a week on the course. Oral discussions with students after the evaluation revealed that this was maybe not a larger issue, but rather specifically related to the reports. Student influence scored 3.6, the students got significant influence on their seminars, but not so much on the rest of the course, they also did not try to seek influence. Some students may have felt too much influence on the reports, lacking more strict guidelines. The course material scored 3.9, some wish for more written material.
The specific comments of the students all focused on different aspects of the course. Only a few have multiple comments, requesting more text on the lecture slides and more clear lab instructions, from the lab supervisors. Both will be considered, however the students overall performed the course tasks as expected, so they must have understood the tasks.

Course development and action plan: Course coordinator's suggestions for changes, comments and actions. Describe the relevant and possible changes to be implemented in the short and long term and when they are planned to be put into action. Specify who is responsible for the implementation: the course coordinator or another teacher. If a problem was identified, explain why nonetheless no consequent changes are warranted. Follow-up of measures proposed based on previous course report(s) should also be presented here.

As several students spend all 4 hours at the exam, next year there will be less questions or more exam time. Development of more short video lectures will be done. As one of the main teachers will not teach the course next year, there will be staff change and likely a significant change in their material. Labs 2 and 3 will be restructured to not require full reports. The guide for lab 4 will need revisions to make some steps more clear. Lab 4-5 might see more drastic changes in the coming year or year after. We will increase the effort for making communication between lab supervisors and students more clear.

Publishing and archiving (arranged by course administrator)

Archiving and publication of the course report: where and when archiving and publication were completed
Published on canvas 2026-10-21

Course administrator

Name	**Date**
Åsa Nilsson	2026-10-21