

## **COURSE REPORT for HT23 2024-02-29**

### **1. Course:**

FMF0064, Communication in Science and Education, 3.5 credits, PhD course

### **2. Term and year:**

HT 2023

### **3. Course coordinators:**

Laia Caja Puigsubira, IMBIM

John Pettersson, IMBIM

### **4. Number of students:**

Registered: 54

### **5. Response Rate**

25/54 = 46%

### **6. Summary of students' views and suggestions**

- This was good with the course (in brackets it is indicated the grade received ranging from 1 to 6, being 1 very bad/nor at all and 6 very good/very useful/to a large extent):
  - Students were overall satisfied with the course (4,6/6), its quality (3,7/6), the course administration (4,6/6), course management (4,8/6), and the course website (4,3/6).
  - The students were also satisfied with achieving course goals (4,7/6), how active they were (5,4/6), and the feedback received by the teachers at the course (4,9/6); Overall the students indicated that compared to before the course, there was an improvement in the students oral presentations skills (6,5 compared to 7,7 out of 10), how to prepare and perform a poster presentation (6 compared to 8 out of 10), how to prepare and perform an oral scientific presentation (6,6 compared to 7,8 out of 10), how to prepare and present research for popular science (5,3 compared to 7,5 out of 10), how to write academic English (6,4 compared to 7,8 out of 10), to write and publish a scientific article (6,5 compared to 7,5 out of 10), transition to open science (4,7 compared to 7,1 out of 10). New for this year, we added a lecture on grant writing, the students indicated that compared to before the course, there was an improvement in their knowledge on grant writing (4,8 compared to 6,7 out of 10). New for this year, we also added the Literature Search lecture that we have in the ISR to the small course, but without the assignment, the students indicated that compared to before the course, there was an improvement in their knowledge on literature search (5,8 compared to 7,5 out of 10).
  - On the pedagogical section, the students commented that the group discussions were very valuable:
    - I really liked the open discussion climate, and the engagement of the teachers and their generous sharing of experience. I learned many ways to try to engage the students, transmit knowledge and encourage reflection and critical thinking - and how complex this is
    - I learned the most in the group discussions. It was really nice to get different perspectives on the cases and problems and how to solve them in a good way.

- This indicated as particularly good; Students comments:
  - Group work
  - Very approachable teachers
  - The group work was very good and a means of learning from one another
  - I especially appreciated Angela Hoffmans lecture, and Eva Garmendias lecture - they were engaging and very good teachers.
  - I did appreciate that we randomly got one of the presentation tasks, as it meant that everyone had to really work together,
  - We received very good feedback on our assignments and the course was overall very interactive. The lectures were informative and relevant.
  - The group work. I really think you should keep the made up cases. I really learned from my peers but at the same time felt I contributed. The group work made it clear where I had my knowledge gaps.
  - The lectures about Science Communication have been really interesting and well-planned. Useful information and resources. The group work sessions were quite nice distributed too.
  
- This could be improved:
  - Have the handouts before the lectures
  - The students would have like to have the option of hybrid lectures throughout the course. We did not plan to have this option, but due to the snowstorm during week 48 (2023), we provided the hybrid option for those living outside of Uppsala. This was appreciated, but then they would have liked to have this option from Day 1.
  - Improved course website.
  - Clear deadlines.
  - Regarding the introduction to teaching part the students commented:
    - This “part of the course was generally a bit unclear/unstructured, and could have benefited from being a bit more structured”
    - More feedback
  - The course schedule is too intense, too many tasks. Some students complained that 8:15-17:00 is too much.
  - More time to read abstracts, perhaps similar to how the popular science session was done.

### **8. Teachers responsible suggestions for improvement**

Suggestion: shortly summarise planned improvements (short- and long-term) and motivate if improvements will not be made on a certain aspect.

We had restructured the website following the students’ comments from previous years, but it still seems unclear for some students where to find the information. One of the students asked to have a Word document with the deadlines for the submission of the different assignments; this already exists and students could find it on the first page of the course. In the scientific presentation section on the course website, one could also clearly see the deadlines. We think this system works, but we will have to explain it better in the introductory lecture.

Some students complained that having the course 8:15-17:00 was too much, or too early, they proposed to start at 9 am or remove lectures. However, we think that all the lectures are very well appreciated making it difficult to decide what to remove. Starting later in the day, at 9:15, would increase the costs when booking the classrooms, and at the end, it would increase the number of days of the course.

The introduction to teaching section received both positive and negative comments. We have discussed with the responsible teacher and she will emphasize in the description of the different assignments what is the goal of each assignment, and improve their description.

## **9. Signature of course responsible teacher and student representative**

John Pettersson, IMBIM, Course leader  
Laia Caja Puigsubira, IMV, Course leader