

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 Immunology		
Course code	Scope (credits)	Semester in which the course is completed
BM821E	15	Spring 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
Jitka Petrlova		10

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	
questionnaire 2026-06-04 - 2026-06-12	
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)
5	50

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: ☒ Through a discussion in class, how: The discussion was conducted by a Zoom meeting. ☐ In other way, how: 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: It was pesented at the introduction to the course. ☐ 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 course results clearly demonstrate that students made good use of the learning activities offered, including recorded lectures, TBL seminars, practical sessions, and group assignments. The median overall grade was C, and the median grade on the written examination was also C. One student improved their final grade by achieving a score of over 80% on the TBL (iRAT) test. Together with the students' feedback on whether the intended learning outcomes had been achieved, these results indicate that the course structure is well appreciated and effectively supports student learning.
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.

Overall, the students appeared to appreciate both the course and the use of Team-Based Learning (TBL) for the theoretical components. According to the course evaluation, both the individual Readiness Assurance Tests (iRATs) and the team Readiness Assurance Tests (tRATs) were perceived as valuable learning activities. The introductory practical laboratory sessions were also considered beneficial, as they helped students develop a better understanding of the theoretical aspects of immunology.

The combination of learning activities including group discussions, oral presentations, seminars, practical laboratory work, and independent study was generally regarded as both effective and engaging. Students suggested that some activities during the independent project period be conducted as online meetings, as this would provide greater flexibility while they are working in the laboratory. The overall course evaluation indicated that the course was rated above average and was well received by the students.

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.

Overall, the scope of the course seems to work well.

The use of AI by students during report writing should be monitored to ensure it is handled appropriately and ethically. The project-based component of the course will continue to be included, as it is highly appreciated and provides students with a broad understanding of how theoretical knowledge can be applied in both research and development settings.

Publishing and archiving (arranged by course administrator)

Archiving and publication of the course report: where and when archiving and publication were completed

Valen

Course administrator

Name	Date
Åsa Nilsson	2026-06-23