

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		
Biological Interfaces in Molecular Biology and Nanotechnology		
Course code	Scope (credits)	Semester in which the course is completed
BM822E	15	Spring semester -25
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
Emelie Nilsson		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 2025-03-27 - 2025-04-04	
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)
7	70

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: posted on the course CANVAS page, and publicised via an announcement ☐ Through a discussion in class, how: ☐ 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: The evaluation will be summarised during the course introduction. ☐ 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
Most students stated that they were able to reach the intended learning outcomes to a high extent (mean score: 4.9/6). Course material, forms of work and different learning activities, together with student responsibility and influence were seen as successful aspects, with high scores for both (mean score: 4.9/6 and 4.3/6). However, the examination format received mixed reviews (mean score: 3.7/6), with concerns that it didn't adequately allow demonstration of knowledge across all course components. The workload was considered high and occasionally overwhelming, especially near the end of the course when report writing and exam preparation overlapped. However, the mean score (3.9/6) still indicated that the students spent 31-40 hours per week on the course. Nonetheless,

students appreciated the research-based nature of the course (mean score: 5.4/6), together with the great internalisation aspects (mean score: 2.7/3) and found the ethics module engaging and insightful.

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.

Student feedback mentioned the course's organization in terms of content quality and research integration as high, but highlighted issues with pacing and workload management. Many students appreciated the lab/practical components and the ethical discussion seminar but found the scheduling demanding, with insufficient time for exam preparation due to overlapping assignments. The students' suggestions were to include more targeted teaching in specific technical areas (e.g., spectroscopy, Excel skills) to help with the workload, clearer expectations/instructions for graded reports, and improvements in communication around how in depth the answers are supposed to be during the oral exam.

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.

Several changes are suggested by the course coordinator/responsible to improve the course, both in the short and longer term. For next semester, clearer and more standardized guidelines for lab reports will be implemented, similar to those provided for Lab Report 2 (as suggested by students). The structure and timing of lab sessions will be revised to try and provide the students more dedicated time to prepare for the oral examination, avoiding the current overlap with intensive report writing. One solution being, is to start the lab sessions earlier and have them run in parallel with the lectures. In the longer term, the format of the oral exam will be reviewed to ensure it more comprehensively reflects student learning across all course components. One potential revision is to allow each student more time, thereby accommodating more questions and varying the topics more to let the students demonstrate their wider knowledge base. These changes will be implemented by the course coordinator, in collaboration with teaching staff. As part of the course development, the successful inclusion of the ethics module, will be maintained, having been well received by the students. The timing will however be changed to allow more time at the end of the course for the students to focus on the exam.

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	2025-04-10