

Evaluation of student course HUIMM906/306 Spring 2017

Background:

Due to many applications, twelve students were selected from the applicants (9 for HUIMM306, 3 for HUIMM906): two PhD fellows, 9 master students and 1 medical student of the research line (forskerlinje). The background was biomedicine (8), molecular biology (1), odontology (2) and medicine (1). The course was an intensive course over 14 days starting Monday May 29. The course was from 8 in the morning until 16 in the afternoon. The course was organized by Silke Appel with help from Richard Davies, Veronika Binder, Kjerstin Jacobsen and Marianne Eidsheim. Karl A. Brokstad had the practical training for one method and Marc Niere had one theoretical lecture.

The plan for the course is given in the appendix. The methods that were included in the course were sterile technique/ cell isolation, cell culture, protein lysis and protein determination, SDS-PAGE and Western blotting, ELISA, PCR and immunofluorescence staining.

The evaluation was performed as a written evaluation.

Nine participants handed in a written evaluation. The questions are listed in the appendix.

One participant following HUIMM906 failed due to incomplete report, all others passed.

Results from the written evaluation

Question A, B, E, F and G were graded from 1 to 6 with 6 being the best (very bad, bad, OK, good, very good, excellent). The average is presented. Question C and D as given 'as is' and question H was comments.

A. What is your general impression of the course?

One graded 'excellent', one graded 'very good to excellent', six graded 'very good', one graded 'ok'.

Mean: 4.9

B. How much did you learn at the course?

Four graded 'very much', three graded 'much', two graded 'some'.

Mean: 4.2

C. Have your expectations been fulfilled with regard to the description of the course?

One graded 'very relevant', eight graded 'relevant'.

D. What do you think about the demands of the course in relation to the credited study points?

Eight graded 'appropriate', one graded 'too much'. – We got 5 points

E. What do you think about the scientific knowledge/background of the lecturers and supervisors?

Three graded 'excellent', five graded 'very good', one graded 'ok'.

Mean: 4.6

F. How were the relevant topics communicated?

One graded 'excellent', seven graded 'very good', one graded 'ok'.

Mean: 4.9

G. How did you like the protocols?

Two graded 'excellent', three graded 'very good', three graded 'good', one graded 'ok'.

Mean: 4.7

H. Comments/suggestions:

Student A: The first days were a bit too messy and hectic. Thanks for the cake! And thanks for letting me be part of this course. A very well chosen set of methods, good tips for further planning of experiments

Student B: Really good and will come in handy in my master project. The teaching was good, could ask all kind of questions and all of them got answered. All information needed was provided in the protocols. If the course will have a 12 people capacity it should be organized to be less time consuming, e.g. a lot of unnecessary waiting.

Appendix

1) Timetable



HUIMM906/306
29.5.-12.6.2017

Date	Time	Task	Supervisor
Monday 29.5. BBB 9A109bP	10:00-10:30	General Introduction	Richard
	10:45-11:30	Introduction Buffy coat/monocytes,	Richard/Kjerstin
	11:45-12:30	Protocols #1, #2, #3 (PBMC isolation+stimulation, Protein concentration)	
	13:30-16:00	Calculation/preparation of buffers/BSA standards	
Tuesday 30.5. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-14:00	Buffy, isolation of PBMC and monocytes – 1 Falcon each, 1 plate (6 wells) per group	Silke/Kjerstin/ Richard
	14:30	add LPS to half of the cells	
	15:00-16:00	lyse cells in 2 of 3 wells of each population	
Wednesday 31.5. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-10:30	BCA assay, Direct Detect	Silke
	10:30-11:30	Introduction SDS-PAGE and WB	Marc
	12:00-13:00	Protocols #4, #5 (SDS-PAGE and WB)	Silke
	13:30	Harvest remaining supernatants (~24h)	Silke/Kjerstin
	14:00-16:00	Prepare gels for WB	Silke/Kjerstin/ Veronika
Thursday 1.6. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-10:00	load gels	Kjerstin/Richard/ Veronika
	10:00-11:30	gel run	
	12:00-13:00	transfer	
	13:00-13:30	Ponceau staining	
	14:00-15:00	blocking	
	15:00-16:00	divide membrane, phosphospecific and total 4°C ON	

Date	Time	Task	Supervisor
Friday 2.6. Conference room BBB KF109F	9:00-9:30	continue WB: washing	Veronika/ Silke
	9:30-10:30	2 nd Ab – Introduction PCR/qPCR	
	10:30-12:30	Washing and detection WB	Silke
	13:00-15:00	Protocol #6 (PCR/qPCR)	
Tuesday 6.6. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-12:00	PCR/qPCR	Silke/Kjerstin
	12:00-14:00	Introduction/Protocol # 7 (Immunostaining), coverslip coating	Silke
	14:00-15:00	seed cells for immunostaining	Kjerstin/Silke
	15:00-16:00	Analyze PCR/qPCR	Silke
Wednesday 7.6. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-12:00	Immunostaining (fix+stain)	Kjerstin
	13:00-15:00	Introduction ELISA, Protocol #8 (ELISA), coat plates	Silke Marianne
	15:00-16:00	Seminar report writing	Richard
Thursday 8.6. BBB 9A109bP	8:00-16:00	ELISA in incubation steps: Immunostaining (analyze)	Marianne/Silke Karl
Friday 9.6. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-11:00	Preparation Result presentation	Silke/Richard
	11:00-12:00	Introduction flow cytometry	Richard
	13:00-16:00	Preparation Results presentations	Silke/Richard
Monday 12.6. BBB 9A109bP	9:00-16:00	Results presentations+discussion Summary/Conclusion	Veronika/Silke/ Richard/

2) The evaluation form

Evaluation of the course

Molecular and cellular methods in immunology – HUIMM906/306

We would greatly appreciate your feedback so we can improve the course.

A. What is your general impression of the course?

very bad --- bad --- OK --- good --- very good --- excellent

B. How much did you learn at the course?

very little --- little --- some --- much --- very much --- a lot

What do you think about the scientific content of the course?

C. Have your expectations been fulfilled with regard to the description of the course?

irrelevant --- relevant --- very relevant

D. What do you think about the demands of the course in relation to the credited study points?

too much / too difficult --- appropriate --- too little / too easy

How was the teaching?

E. What do you think about the scientific knowledge/background of the lecturers and supervisors?

very bad --- bad --- OK --- good --- very good --- excellent

F. How were the relevant topics communicated?

very bad --- bad --- OK --- good --- very good --- excellent

G. How did you like the protocols?

very bad --- bad --- OK --- good --- very good --- excellent

H. Comments/suggestions: (use backside if necessary)