

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 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
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 2026-03-26 - 2026-04-03

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)

4

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)

40

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 as a part of the course 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

Due to the low response rate (40%) this year, it is difficult to draw conclusions based on the questionnaire, and therefore, an emphasis has been placed on the free-text responses. Overall, students reported that they were able to achieve the intended learning outcomes to a high extent (mean score: 5.0/6). Course materials, forms of work, and various learning activities, together with opportunities for student responsibility and influence, were identified as key strengths, all receiving above-average ratings (ranging from 3.8–5.2 out of 6).

As in previous years, the final examination format (oral exam) received mixed reviews (mean score: 4.2/6), although outcomes were positive, with more than 60% of students passing on their first attempt and 90% had passed on after the first re-examination opportunity. The workload was considered high and at times overwhelming, particularly in relation to the deadlines for two of the

five laboratory reports. However, the mean score (4.2/6) indicates that most students reported spending approximately 31–40 hours per week on the course. Students appreciated the research-based nature of the course (mean score: 5.2/6), as well as the strong internationalisation component (mean score: 2.5/3), 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 highlighted a high quality of course content and strong integration of research. However, issues were raised regarding pacing and workload management, particularly in connection with laboratory reports 1 and 2. While students appreciated the lab/practical components, some suggested modifying the assessment format, by for example, replacing one or two written lab reports with oral presentations. Another suggestion was to restructure the practical components into one larger, more coherent project spanning multiple time points. Concerns were also raised about the limited time available during the final oral examination, with students indicating that they needed more time to reflect on questions before responding. At the same time, it was described the format as valuable practice for developing oral communication skills. Additionally, students suggested including more visual aids on Canvas, such as videos or 3D representations, to better support lecture content, particularly for topics involving complex structures.

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 proposed by the course coordinator to improve the course in both the short and long term. The structure and scheduling of lab sessions will be revised to create a more integrated sequence of labs, reducing the number of required reports. At least one written report may be replaced with an oral presentation to diversify assessment methods. These changes aim to reduce student stress and improve time management by allowing more spacing between assignments and the final oral examination. To address concerns regarding the oral exam, students may be given 15–30 minutes of preparation time prior to the examination to reflect on the questions. All changes will be implemented by the course coordinator in collaboration with the teaching staff. The ethics module will be retained in its current format and timing, as it was well received this year, particularly compared to the previous year when it was scheduled too close to the final examination.

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	2026-04-09