

## EMNERAPPORT – INSTITUTT FOR BIOMEDISIN

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT – DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICINE

Emnekode: <i>COURSE CODE:</i>	<b>BMED 381</b>	Semester / år: SEMESTER / YEAR:	<b>Spring semester 2018</b>
Emnenavn: <i>COURSE NAME:</i>	<i>Biomedical Nutrition Physiology</i>		
Emneansvarlig: <i>COURSE COORDINATOR:</i>	Tanja Kögel	Godkjent: <i>APPROVED:</i> (admin.)	Studieleder IBM, 21.06.2018
Rapporteringsdato: <i>DATE OF REPORT:</i>	<b>21.6.2018</b>		

### INNLEDNING / INTRODUCTION:

Kort beskrivelse av emnet, inkl. studieprogramtilhørighet. Kommentarer om evt. oppfølging av tidligere evalueringer.

*SHORT COURSE DESCRIPTION, INCLUDING WHICH STUDENTS/CANDIDATES MAY ATTEND. COMMENTS TO CHANGES BASED ON PRIOR EVALUATIONS.*

*Biomedical Nutrition Physiology* (5 ECTS) is a course available for students who have obtained skills in biology, biochemistry, molecular biology, cell biology, nutrition physiology - or equivalent - on bachelor level, preferably completed with a degree.

The aim of the course is to train the students to evaluate the effects of food and food supplements at a cell biological and physiological level in a broader scientific context relating to health and disease.

The course aims to give the students a research-based introduction into biomedical subjects (biochemistry, molecular biology, cell biology, physiology) in connection with human nutritional physiology. Focusing on areas like metabolism, signaling pathways and gene regulation, basic mechanisms that involve and are affected by the diet composition will be explored. Students will also learn about the background of lifestyle diseases, genetic diseases, and the effects of undesired toxicants in the diet.

The course aims at developing skills necessary for independent, critical research interpretation within this field, i.e. reading, interpreting and discussing scientific articles, writing and presentation. In addition to attending the lectures, we will ask the students to read relevant scientific articles, to discuss them in a small group, and to present them in the form of a small essay, a short oral presentation and a poster.

8 students were registered for the final exam in *Biomedical Nutrition Physiology* this semester;

- 1 visiting student through an international agreements with The Faculty of Medicine,
- 2 Master student in Biomedical Sciences (MAMD-MEDBI),
- 2 Master students in Clinical Nutrition (MAMD-NUCLI),
- 2 Master students in Human Nutrition (MAMD-NUHUM), and
- 1 visiting student at The Faculty of Medicine.

*Mitt UiB* (<http://mitt.uib.no>) is the Learning Management System (LMS) used by all courses at University of Bergen. The student can find Syllabus and information at the Course site, contact information and lecture notes (if given). The Course site is also used for evaluation, see further down.

For course description, visit <http://uib.no/course/BMED381>

For previous evaluation reports, please visit <https://kvalitetsbasen.app.uib.no/popup.php?kode=BMED381>

<b>STATISTIKK / STATISTICS (admin.):</b>			
Antall vurderingsmeldte studenter: <i>NUMBER OF CANDIDATES REGISTERED FOR EXAMINATION:</i>		<b>8</b>	Antall studenter møtt til eksamen: <i>NUMBER OF CANDIDATES ATTENDED EXAMINATION:</i>
<b>7</b>			
Karakter-skala <i>GRADING SCALE</i>	«Bestått/ikke bestått» <i>«PASS/FAIL»</i>	<b>Bestått / PASS:</b>	<b>Ikke bestått / FAIL:</b>
		<b>7</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>KOMMENTARER TIL KARAKTERFORDELINGEN / COMMENTS TO THE STATISTICS:</b>			
<p>Emnerapporten utarbeides når sensuren etter ordinær eksamen i emnet er klar. For muntlige eksamener er da resultatfordelingen endelig, men for skriftlige eksamener kan endelig resultatfordeling avvike noe om evt. klagebehandling ikke er fullført.</p> <p><i>THIS REPORT IS PREPARED AFTER ORDINARY EXAMINATION. FOR ORAL EXAMS, THE RESULTS ARE FINAL, FOR WRITTEN EXAMS, THE FINAL GRADING DISTRIBUTION MAY DIFFER SLIGHTLY IF CANDIDATE COMPLAINTS/APEALS HAVE NOT BEEN PROCESSED.</i></p> <p>The course is build up as several modules. In addition to attending lectures, the students participate in the oral/power-point presentation of 1-3 scientific articles, discussed by the whole group thereafter. In addition to the subject-lectures and student-presentations/seminars, the students get introductory lectures on scientific statistics, reading, writing, poster-making and presenting prior to their tasks: They need to pick a topic and write an essay in review style. The course leader provides written feedback and the student sends an improved version of the essay to the censurer who admits the student to the exam if the quality of the essay is sufficient. The exam is a 5 minute poster-presentation on the same topic, followed by 10-20 minutes of discussion of the topic.</p> <p>Censurer and course leader deemed all deliveries as corresponding to A-C, passed. There were clear differences in the quality of the deliverances between students.</p>			
<b>SAMMENDRAG AV STUDENTENE SINE TILBAKEMELDINGER / SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS GIVEN BY THE STUDENTS</b>			
<p>Spørreundersøkelse via Mitt UiB, annen evaluering, tilbakemelding fra tillitsvalgte og/eller andre.</p> <p><i>COURSE EVALUATION ON MITT UIB, OTHER EVALUATIONS, RESPONSES FROM THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES AND/OR OTHERS.</i></p> <p>The students were asked to give their feedback in a short survey at Mitt UiB. Some of these questions were Multiple Choice Questions (MCQ), while others opened up for the students to give their own opinion as written text.</p> <p>The survey was opened 15 May until 27 May, while the oral exam took place 30 May. Information about the survey was given by the course leader during lectures and twice by email.</p> <p>5 of 8 students (63%) gave their responses this semester, representing 3 different study programs as well as one not telling which group he/she belongs to.</p> <p>All of them found the academic contents to be appropriate, and the general organization/structure of the course as OK (3:5) and well organized (2:5).</p> <p>The educational level of the teaching was ranked bad (1:5), average (2:5) and high (2:5).</p> <p>The total workload was ranked appropriate (3:5) and too much (2:5).</p> <p>Written comments were only provided by two students (answers partially translated from Norwegian):</p> <p>What was good?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The course was informative</li> <li>- Many good guest lecturers</li> </ul> <p>What would you like to see changed in the course?</p>			

- I cannot see that the lecturers have to prepare much. They are all trained in presenting knowledge. Students do not have that training and it may be important to remind the students that they need to be understandable and clear when they present research articles to class. They need to ask themselves: How would I like to get introduced to the topic if I would not have any knowledge about that before. *Comment from course leader: Student presentation training is part of the goal of the course. I will try to emphasize that more in the future. I will also emphasize that even experienced presenters need preparation to be good.*
- It seems that not all lecturers have gotten the same message about that there was going to be a student presentation, and not all of them discussed the article after the presentation. *Comment from course leader: The lecturers got the message to lead a discussion of the 10 min student presentation of the article (chosen by the respective lecturer), after the student presentation. I will also encourage the lecturers in the future to ensure the article has been well-interpreted by the student group.*

Did your interest for nutrition science increase, decrease or stay the same?

- It increased.
- It increased.

The oral feedback I got within the course was positive. The group of students this year was in my impression working hard and delivered well, but they were relatively quiet and needed considerable encouragement to speak up.

#### **EMNEANSVARLIG SIN EVALUERING OG VURDERING / EVALUATION AND COMMENTS BY COURSE COORDINATOR:**

Faglæreres vurderinger av emnet. *TEACHER COMMENTS.*

Eksempel: Kommentarer om praktisk gjennomføring, undervisnings- og vurderingsformer, evt. endringer underveis, studieinformasjon på nett og Mitt UiB, litteraturløst, samt lokaler og utstyr.

*EXAMPLE: COMMENTS ABOUT PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT METHODS, IF NECESSARY. FUTURE CHANGES/CHANGES IN PROGRESS, STUDY INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET AND MITT UIB, LITERATURE ACCESS, LOCALES AND EQUIPMENT.*

Overall, I believe the course provides meaningful training in scientific dissemination and presentation for the students, including a comprehensive introduction to the field. However, the working load to train so few students is considerable – 10% position plus guest teachers for 7 students.

In order to improve the work-outcome balance the course could open for more students. It is usually fully booked, limited to 14 students, but then on the first day only 8-9 come and then 1-2 hop off. Maybe the number of students could be increased by opening up the course for 20 students in the registration. 20 essay corrections would be hard, but I doubt the risk is high that 20 students complete the course, but maybe we end up with a few more students.

Last year I planned, due to student feedback, to do the «how to present» and «how to write» lessons earlier during the course as the students want to start writing/preparing earlier. I did that and it was an improvement. I also posted all instructive presentations on Mitt UiB, and this year there were fewer unclearities for the students about guidelines. I also insured that the «track changes and bubble functions were known by all students, which was a problem last year, and this year, that went fine. *Furthermore, I instructed all lecturers and students that non-participation in the discussions is not acceptable. All need to say something. I still find that crucial.*

I had tried to encourage all guest lecturers to come up with *a few multiple choice questions before each lecture, to increase student attention, and to send the questions to me thereafter*, so I can compile them

and give as a check-once –more to the students That was not followed consistently and required reminders and *might not be worth the administrative effort in a course with so many lecturers.*

*I need to keep reminding the supervisors to be responsive as the students have deadlines, too, and the students to show up to appointments, as professors/researchers often live a busy life.*

**MÅL FOR NESTE UNDERVISNINGSPERIODE – FORBEDRINGSTILTAK / PLANNED CHANGES FOR THE NEXT TEACHING PERIOD – HOW TO BE BETTER:**

Couse structure as 2018 – implementations from last year were mostly successful. I will heed the improvement possibilities in italic in the two sections above.

Next year there will be the challenge of recruiting new lecturers, as several of the lecturers discontinued working at our institute (HI, formerly NIFES) or indicated not to be motivated to continue teaching. I will need to recruit lecturers from the nutrition institutes. The workload for each lecturer would be one 45 min lecture on their specialty, providing one scientific article for the student presentation and 45 minutes discussion of that article and presentation with the student group. The lecturers may also be chosen as a supervisor for the essay topic decision, but the students are encouraged to use their master supervisor for that, if they have already found one. Jutta Dierkes indicated that that should not be a problem. However, it needs to be clarified if that is in line with administrative rules. If that is not possible, a course in 2019 might be difficult to be fully staffed.

Furthermore, for 2020, the financing situation is not clear. Formerly NIFES payed, HI (now fused with NIFES per 1.1.2018) will not. The contract valid to 2019 will be fulfilled.

I am willing to continue to lead this course if financed. However, the leadership needs to discuss whether a possible continuation or discontinuation of the course makes most sense. I will be available for such discussion.