



CHALMERS

Course board meeting: Minutes

<i>Course name:</i>	Biochemistry and molecular biology	<i>Programme owning the course:</i>	Biotechnology, MCS program
<i>Course code:</i>	KBB032		
<i>Academic year:</i>	21/22	<i>Department instructing the course:</i>	Biology and Biological engineering
<i>Study period:</i>	1		

Meeting participants: Examiner: Michaela Wenzel.
Director of studies: Eva Albers
Students: Cornelia Nielsen-Munk (MP bio), David Perhed (MP bio), Alvin Ånestrand (Engineering Mathematics), Magali Jullemier (Exchange student)

Date: 20 januari 2022

Summary

- * There was an unusually large response rate of the survey.
- * The course consisted of two parts, a biochemistry part and a molecular biology part.
- * A teacher and examiner for the course, Christer Larsson, tragically passed away during the course. This resulted in that the students had to study his part of the course, about biochemistry, using last year's lecture notes.
- * The other teacher, Michaela, had to answer questions from Christer's part of the course, which she was not prepared for.
- * The workload was a bit high as the biochemistry part were harder without lectures.
- * The students general impression of the course was understandably affected negatively by Christer's absence. Many parts of the course that actually worked were good on the other hand, as the lectures and labs. Especially the work environment was very appreciated according to the survey.

Prerequisites and learning outcomes

- * The students had very different background knowledge. Michaela will work on how to deal with this, for example by beginning with molecular biology.

Learning, examination and course administration

- * The structure of the course was good.
- * The lectures and videos for the molecular biology part were appreciated.

Labs:

- * The TA responsible for labs, Maximilian Otto, was appreciated.
- * Some lab report instructions were unclear and not accessible.
- * The students had to write a lab report for one of the labs. The feedback from Maximilian on the lab report was good.
- * The labs were hard to connect to lectures. The TA was not properly informed of the circumstances. When studying using Christer's notes it was also harder to keep track of when you had to have read the material of a certain lecture to be well prepared for a lab.
- * The curriculum might need to be changed for the labs if there will be many changes for next year.
- * The the second lab, about oxidative phosphorylation, was extra difficult. It could be due to lack of lectures.

Exam:

- * The exam was hard to complete in the given time.
- * The students were not informed about allowed aids on the exam in time.
- * Results: many got 4 or 5, none failed.

Literature:

- * There was no literature for the molecular biology part of the course, which made it hard to study by yourself.
- * The notes for Christer's part of the course were insufficient. This will not be a problem next year as Michaela takes over his part as well.
- * The book for the biochemistry part is really detailed, and the students did not get information about what was important. Two suggested solutions are having complementary videos, and a list of pages or sections in the book that are especially important.

Work climate

- * It was a good working environment.
- * Some thought that there was too much group discussions, perhaps people with more background knowledge. Others thought it was the right amount of group discussions.
- * Home exercises were sometimes done twice, once home and once the next lecture.
- * Interactions worked well.

To keep for next course round

- * Content and structure of the course.
- * The videos for the molecular biology part.

Suggested changes

- * The time pressure on the exam could be reduced.
- * The lab report instructions could be more clear and accessible.
- * There could be more written assignments.
- * There could be a lecture before the exam for going through an old exam, to make it clear for the students how the examiner would like the questions to be answered.

Other matters

- * A major change from last year was that the lectures were not on Zoom, which resulted in larger group discussions and more interaction. There were also more answers to questions and higher participation in lectures.