

## **COURSE REPORT for HT24 2025-01-03**

### **1. Course:**

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

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

HT 2024

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

Laia Caja Puigsubira, IMBIM

Patric Jern, IMBIM

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

Registered to CSE: 42 students

Registered to Introduction to teaching: 3 students

### **5. Response Rate**

19/45 = 42%

### **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 (average 4,7 out of 6), its quality (3,9/6), the course administration (3,9/6), course management (4,1/6), and the course website (4,4/6).
  - The students were also satisfied with achieving course goals (4,9/6), how active they were (5,5/6), and the feedback received by the teachers at the course (5,2/6);

Overall the students indicated that compared to before the course, there was an improvement in the students oral presentations skills (5,2 compared to 7,5 out of 10), how to prepare and perform a oral scientific presentation (6,1 compared to 7,7 out of 10), how to prepare and present research for popular science (3,5 compared to 6,8 out of 10), how to write academic English (5,9 compared to 7,4 out of 10), to write and publish a scientific article (5,4 compared to 7,1 out of 10), transition to open science (4,6 compared to 6,9 out of 10). New from last 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 (4,6 compared to 6,9 out of 10). New for last 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 (5,6 compared to 7,6 out of 10).

- This indicated as particularly good; Students comments:
  - *The combination of lectures, seminars and group works.*
  - *Feedback about poster, presentation.*
  - *The feedback sessions.*
  - *Possibility to be active and all the feedback. both receiving feedback and learning to give feedback. The social media lecture.*
  - *The poster presentation try-out: good way to learn by doing, Motivated teachers: can feel and see you care. You manage to touch upon many things in short time. We were also given hands-on information! Especially grant application lecture was good regarding this.*
  
- On the pedagogical section, the students commented that the most relevant thing(s) you learned during the course were:
  - *How to engage students more*
  - *Tools to improve students activity*
  - *Different techniques to involve the student, make classes more interactive. Tips and tricks in difficult situations*
  
- This could be improved:
  - *Some lessons were very long. I also think the group work with the project could be relevant if we could use our own research.*
  - *Systematic searching (very good lecture!) - try it out ourselves on the spot.*
  - *Long days, maybe not schedule until 17.*
  - *Unequal amount of work and feedback depending on what assignment you got to present. It would be better with discussion abstract and PopScience in groups and then present feedback in larger groups. More clearly description of the different assignments.*
  - *More theoretical knowledge on teaching (lectures on teaching).*
  - *Not to have assignments to do before the course starts: Reading for the Introduction to teaching, and Twitter assignment.*
  - *No need to have an extra feedback overview after the Oral Presentations.*
  - *The students would have like to have Nick Brown and Angela Hoffman in the Abstract feedback session, instead of the two Pre-clinical Professors/Researcher.*
  
- On the pedagogical section, the students suggested improvements:
  - *Fewer assignments, it was a lot to submit and kind of confusing*
  - *More clear schedule. Smaller groups (many open questions with long silences because nobody dared talk in the big group) or change the questions to anonymous like mentimeter.*
  - *It was very messy and felt unorganized. Hard to understand the different assignments. Too much to read before the first lecture.*

- *The teacher could present the lecture like she wanted us to do, in a more pedagogic way*
- The students would like a guideline on how to handle difficult teaching scenarios.

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

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

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 appreciated making it difficult to prioritise 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, who will emphasize in the description of the different assignments, goal(s) of each assignment, and improve instructions.

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

Patric Jern, IMBIM, Course leader

Laia Caja Puigsubira, IMBIM, Course leader