Course analysis BIOR58 Foundations of Neurobiology Autumn 2018

Course leader: Eric Warrant/Stanley Heinze
Other teachers:

Eva Ekblad (eva.ekblad@med.lu.se)
Per Ekström (Per.Ekstrom@med.lu.se)
Pierre Tichit (Pierre.Tichit@biol.lu.se)
Sandra Chaib (sandra.Chaib@biol.lu.se)
Lana Khaldy (lana.khaldy@biol.lu.se)
David Dreyer (david.dreyer@biol.lu.se)
James Foster (James.Foster@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: 31 registered students

Grades: 7 Fail (U), 7 Pass (G), 17 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 4.2). This is a slight improvement over last year’s grade (4.0), and liken last year the students especially appreciated the tutorials (and the close interaction with the lecturers and the feedback they received on their essays), the course organization (with theory, labs, tutorials and essays, all receiving a score ≥ 3.8) and with the theoretical part of the course coming first, and the lectures and the lecturers (and many appreciated the research lectures: score 4.0). The students, like last year, still found the workload to be unevenly distributed, with far more stress due to submission deadlines in the second month of the course compared to the first. They suggested that the workload should somehow be evened out. Another criticism was that the number of tutorials seems excessive and that fewer and more concentrated tutorials would be better.

II. Comments from the teachers team
The teachers on the course considered that the course went very smoothly, but all of course recognized that the students were more stressed in the second half of the course. However, we are still very satisfied with our new format with essays and tutorials (introduced in 2017) and feel that these have made a great improvement in the quality of the course.

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. Unfortunately, this 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 two 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. Reduce the number of tutorials from 8 to 6.
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