Course analysis BIOR58 Foundations of Neurobiology Autumn 2019

**Course leader:** Eric Warrant/Stanley Heinze  
**Other teachers:**

Lena Uller (lena.uller@med.lu.se)  
Per Ekström (Per.Ekstrom@med.lu.se)  
Anna Honkanen (anna.honkanen@biol.lu.se)  
Elisa Rigosi (elisa.rigosi@biol.lu.se)  
Pierre Tichit (pierre.tichit@biol.lu.se)  
Josiane da Silva Freitas (josiane.da_silva_freitas@biol.lu.se)  
Ayse Yilmaz-Heusinger (ayse.yilmaz-heusinger@biol.lu.se)  
Adriana Schatton (adriana.schatton@biol.lu.se)  
Mikael Ljungholm (mikael.ljungholm@biol.lu.se)  
Marcel Sayre (marcel.sayre@biol.lu.se)  
Lana Khaldy (lana.khaldy@biol.lu.se)  
David Dreyer (david.dreyer@biol.lu.se)  
Almut Kelber (Almut.Kelber@biol.lu.se)  
Andrea Adden (Andrea.Adden@biol.lu.se)  
Dan-Eric Nilsson (Dan-E.Nilsson@biol.lu.se)

**Number of students:** 32 registered students

**Grades:** 5 Fail (U), 11 Pass (G), 16 Pass w distinction (VG).

**Evaluation**

**I. Summary of the course evaluation**

Number of answers: 17

*Short summary of the result:* Overall the students were very pleased with the course (grade 4.1). This is a slight decrease last year’s grade (4.2), and overall, with the exception of lab practicals (which saw its grade fall from 4.0 in 2018 to 3.4 this year), the grades on all aspects of the course were similar to 2018. As in previous years the students especially appreciated the tutorials (and the close interaction with the lecturers and the feedback they received on their essays: grade 3.9 up from 3.8 last year), the lectures (4.1 vs 4.1 in 2018), the research lectures (4.1 vs 4.0 in 2018) and the essays (4.0 vs 4.1 in 2018). A worrying development concerns the lab practicals which have clearly suffered this year. The main criticism concerned the lab reports and particularly the page limit relative to what is expected to be included (which seemed too great). The students, like last year, still found the workload to be unevenly distributed, despite our efforts to change this (which included removing a second lab report submission deadline after receiving feedback).

**II. Comments from the teachers team**

The teachers on the course considered that the course again went very smoothly, but are surprised that the students were more still stressed in the second half of the course. We may have to review our requirements for lab reports. However, we are still very satisfied with our new format with essays and tutorials (introduced in 2017).
III. **Evaluation of changes made since the previous course**
After the previous course, we received the same major criticism we received this year concerning the uneven workload. As a result of last year's evaluation, we removed one of the more difficult deadlines entirely – the requirement for a second lab submission following feedback. Unfortunately, some students now complained that there was no longer this opportunity in the course (so its damned if you do, damned if you don’t). But nonetheless, this change clearly didn’t solve the problem completely, as indicated by a continued commentary to that affect by the students.

IV. **Suggested changes for the next course**
The next time the course is given we plan to consider three possibilities to improve the major criticisms of the course:

1. To place the first lab week towards the end of the first month (which would push some of the final lectures and the 2nd exam into the first week of the second month and would spread out the lab report marking and revision). This would spread the stress and the deadlines.

2. Review our requirements for lab reports and make sure that page limits and required content better match.

3. Reduce the number of tutorials from 8 to 6.
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