

#### AALBORG UNIVERSITET

Studienævn for Medicin Studienævn for Sundhed og Teknologi Studienævn for Idræt og Folkesundhedsvidenskab Institut for Medicin og Sundhedsteknologi

Marts 2023

# Semesterkoordinators evalueringsrapport for Medicin with Industrial Specialization 1st semester Master

Årstal: Efterår 2022

Semesterkoordinator/dato for udarbejdelse af rapport: 20/3-23 Maj Schneider Thomsen Antal afholdte styrings-/semestergruppemøder på semestret: 2 Bilag vedhæftet: 0

### Studiestart

Overall, the students have been satisfied with the semester start.

The international students address that there is not enough introduction to PBL and they lack a better integration. They do not find the current PBL course useful. More social events which should be financed by AAU.

At the beginning of the modules, a thorough introduction to each module with the alignment of expectations for the exam and specification of obligatory elements would have been beneficial.

### Semestret generelt

63 % have filled in the Survey (8 BM students, 13 TM students, and 8 MMA students). Overall, a good evaluation of the semester however the integration of international students has not been good.

### Projektmodul

93 % of the students made an agreement with the supervisor at the beginning of the project. This agreement did not work in practice for 40 % of the student, 41 % think the communication with the supervisor was not good, and 22 % felt the project supervisor was not engaged in the project. To support these evaluations, one writes specific problems with supervisors speaking in Danish to English-speaking students, and others that there was a lack of supervisor engagement in projects, 3 students write that they felt their supervisor had too many groups, and a few MMA students found they would have benefitted from more help in the beginning of the project.

Two comments were made regarding the project proposal and group formation on BM/TM. The projects were difficult to remember after the project presentations and it was not easy to get integrated into the groups as an international student. The project proposal form was also evaluated in the semester group meeting.

30 % did not feel they had the option to use facilities such as laboratories, group rooms, libraries etc. to a sufficient extent. This is supported by comments that the students missed having group rooms due to the move to SUND AAU.

## Kursusmoduler

**Quality improvement and quality assurance:** Mixed evaluation of the module. 86 % of the students agreed/highly agreed that the lecturers of the course were engaged in the course. 31 % of the students did not have a high work effort and 39 % of the students had a low engagement in the module. This is supported by comments about, they felt the lectures were too long, and lacked structure and perspective in the course. 25 % did not feel the module provided a setting for working with fellow students, this is supported by a comment that more group work could be integrated instead of lectures. 36 % of the students did not feel they had the option for receiving feedback and 28 % of the students did not feel the course was well delivered. One commented that some course material was in Danish and that the lecturers should be reminded to speak in English.

**Molecular pathogenesis:** Great evaluation. 25 % of the students felt the academic level was too low this is supported by a comment that many lectures felt like a repetition of lectures from the BA.

**Molecular and Cellular Methods in Biomedicine.** Great evaluation. 24 % of the student felt the academic was too high, this seems from the comments to be related to specific subjects of the course.

Designing and evaluating pharmacological research. Great evaluation.

**Methods of Economic Evaluation in Healthcare.** Overall, a great evaluation. 38 % of the students felt the module lacked activities to support collaboration with fellow students and 38 % did not feel they had the opportunity to receive scientific feedback. 25 % lacked some communication and engagement from the lecturers.

**Marketing and market access for healthcare.** Overall, a great evaluation. 29 % of the students felt the module lacked activities to support collaboration with fellow students.

### Studiemiljø

24 % of the students felt the facilities were not suitable for teaching and having social breaks with fellow students. 31 % did not feel the study environment supports the academic environment. This is supported by the comments that the facilities were very cold, and they lacked group rooms due to the move to SUND AAU.

27 % do not think that the digital options they have available supports support contact with fellow students, this is supported by a comment that one thinks that digital teaching results in poor interaction between lecturers and students and thus low engagement.

One student has felt discrimination by both fellow students and lecturers and the student does not feel heard despite contacting lecturers and the semester coordinator.

### Action points/planlagte tiltag

BM/TM project presentations. The presentations will be distributed after the presentations and the group formation will be located on a separate day allowing the students to reflect on the presentations.

We will continue to encourage the students to form groups across nationalities based on research interests and not based on whom they know.

Investigate if the institute will allocate more resources to support the integration of international students.

**Quality improvement and quality assurance:** Implementation of more group work, emphasize to the students that they need to prepare in advance for the session to make the most of the course and make sure that teaching activities are in English.

To improve the study environment, we have moved facilities to SUND AAU.

Clarify to the semester start that this Master Program will differ from a bachelor's education and that there is a steep learning curve regarding the project and lectures. Link to the "Study Activity Model" and the curriculum.