Evaluation of PhD course HUIMM905: Inflammation – Root of All Things Evil (Spring 2017)

Background:
The evaluation was performed as a written evaluation.
Six participants handed in a written evaluation. The program and the evaluation form are listed in the appendix.

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

A. What is your general impression of the course?
Three graded 'good', one graded 'very good', and two graded 'excellent'.
Mean: 4.8

B. How much did you learn at the course?
Three graded 'some', one graded 'much', one 'very much', and one 'a lot'.
Mean: 4

C. Have your expectations been fulfilled with regard to the description of the course?
Four graded 'relevant', two graded 'very relevant'

D. What do you think about the demands of the course in relation to the credited study points?
Four graded 'appropriate', one 'too little / too easy', one didn't answer

E. How were the relevant topics communicated?
One graded 'OK', one graded between 'OK' and 'good', one graded 'good', one graded 'very good' and two graded 'excellent'
Mean: 4.6

F. Comments/suggestions:
Participant A: Start at 9:00, lunch at 11:30-12:00
Participant B: Very comfortable atmosphere, nice and friendly
Participant C: The talks were very specific and mostly addressed to people with medical background – which sometimes made it hard to follow. More small breaks between talks (5 min) would be nice. Talks not longer than 20-25 min if possible. Try to make it more interactive.
Participant D: More small breaks in between and shorter talks will help to keep your attention/listening to the speaker.

Participant E: The talks were sometimes too long, it was hard to follow everything without a medical background. Maybe more small breaks to keep your mind and attention to the talks.

Appendix

1) The program

Inflammation- Root of All Things Evil
4th Bergen Research School in Inflammation
5th–7th April 2017, Voss

Venue: FLEISCHERS HOTEL   www.fleischers.no

	WEDNESDAY April 5th	THURSDAY April 6th	FRIDAY April 7th
07.00			
08.00		Breakfast	Breakfast
09.00			
10.00		Patrick Venables Keynote	Francesca Barone[10]
			Thomas Dietrich[11]
11.00		Arno Hänninen[6]	Veronika Binder / Coffee break (15min)
		Liv Eidsmo[7]	Eirik Bratland[12]
12.00		Coffee break (15min)	Yenan Bryceson[13]
		Ulrika Islander[8]	Closing Remarks by Silke Appel
		Trevor Owens[9]	
13.00		Marta Kaminska	
			Lunch and departure
14.00	Welcome by Roland Jonsson	Lunch + Time off	
	Helga Midtbø[1]		
15.00	Coffee break		
	Espen Haavardsholm[2]		
16.00			
	Valeriya Lyssenko[3]		
17.00	Coffee break	Alexander Hellesen	
	Anca Catrina[4]	Ewa Bielecka	
		Coffee break (15min)	
18.00	Philippe Gillery[5]	Poster Session (with beer/wine)	
19.00			
20.00	Dinner	Conference Dinner	

Keynote Speaker: Patrick Venables " How to cure autoimmune disease"

1. "The Bearing of Inflammation on Cardiovascular Diseases; Present Knowledge and Future Chalanges", University of Bergen, Norway

2. "Modern Treatment Strategies in RA", Oslo University, Norway

3. "Diabetes Pathogenesis - One Disease Many Faces", University of Bergen, Norway

4. "Novel insights in early seropositive RA: from triggering to targeting", Karolinska Institute, Sweden

5. "Carbamylation of Proteins : a Non-enzymatic Protein Modification Involved in Ageing and Chronic Diseases", University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne, France

6. "Gut Immune System in Type 1 Diabetes", University of Turku, Finland

7. "Resident T cells dictate the inflammatory landscape in the skin", Karolinska Institute, Sweden

8. "Inhibition of inflammation and osteoporosis by estrogens", University of Gothenburg, Sweden

9. "Neuroinflammation" ,University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

10. "From pathogenesis to new clinical targets in Sjögren's syndrome", Birmingham University, UK

11. "All is in The Root", Birmingham University, UK

12. "Innate and adaptive immunity in Addison's disease, a prototypical autoimmune disorder", University of Bergen, Norway

13. "SAMD9L: At the nexus of viral immunity, inflammation, and cancer" ,Karolinska Institute and University of Bergen, Norway

2) The evaluation form

Evaluation of the course

Inflammation – Root of All Things Evil (Advanced course in Immunology) – HUIMM905
Spring 2017

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. How were the relevant topics communicated?

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

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

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 unneccesary waiting.

Appendix

1) Timetable

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

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

COURSE REPORT

Course code: INTH321A/INTH921 Course title: Experimental epidemiology	Semester: Spring 2017	Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care
Course coordinator: Thorkild Tylleskär	Approved in: Programme Committee for Global Health Date: December 2017	

INTRODUCTION

Learning outcomes:

On completion of the course
the student should have the following learning outcomes defined in terms of knowledge, skills and general competence:

Knowledge	*Skills*	*General competence*
The student : - demonstrates understanding of the principles of clinical and field trials, - explains the principles behind adjustment for repeated measurement of outcomes in the same individuals	The student is able to: - contribute to the planning and conduct of clinical and field trails in accordance with the EU Directive 2001/20/EC on Good Clinical Practice and the highest ethical principles, including those reflected in Article 6 of the Treaty on the European Union, in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and the Council of Europa's Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine - assess and select relevant designs for clinical/field trials, - for both individually and community-randomized trials, conduct: sample size estimations, random allocation and blinding/masking - analyze clinical and field trial data-sets, also from community-randomized trials - identify interaction (in trials with stratified as well as un-stratified randomization) - identify and adjust for any confounding effect (mainly relevant for trials with limited sample size).	The student is able to: - critically interpret published results from clinical/field trials - write a competitive research grant proposal for funding of a clinical/field trial.

STATISTICS INTH321A:

Number of students: 6	Number of students completing the course: 6

Grade distribution ->:	A: 0	B: 3	C: 3	D: 0	E: 0	F: 0
Or ->:	Pass:			Fail:		

STATISTICS INTH921:

Number of students: 15	Number of students completing the course: 15

Grade distribution ->:	A: 2	B: 8	C: 5	D: 0	E: 0	F: 0
Or ->:						

2017 Course evaluation INTH321A & 921

First, we ask you to put in your overall rating of various aspects of the course (by circling the relevant score/rating where 1 means Poor and 5 means Excellent or 1=not useful, 5=very useful).

		Mean	Low	High
1. Relevance of the course (all in all)		4.65	3	5
2. Quality of the teaching (all in all)		4.30	2	5
3. Quality of lectures		4.10	2	5
4. How would you rate the usefulness of MittUiB?	4.79	4	5	
5. How did you find the daily assignments?		4.50	3	5
6. How did you find the height measurement assignments?	4.05	3	5	
7. How did you find the group assignments (article and protocol)?		4.45	2	5
8. How was the recommended literature?		4.21	2	5
9. Course management/administration		4.25	3	5
10. How well did the course fulfil your expectations?		4.20	2	5
11. Your overall evaluation of the course		4.35	3	5

In the next section we ask you to provide us with suggestions on how we can improve the different aspects of the course.

12. How can we improve the relevance of the course?
- By adding more challenging daily assignments
- Too much focused on clinical trials, it should include other types of randomised trials
- If possible increase the duration, especially lab hours
- Make the students read the book or some literature before the course. Esp. if you're not into statistics yet.
- It is already very relevant but if the students have some datasets of their own they'll benefit on the go as far as their data analysis is concerned.
- To focus on advance statistical analysis, cluster randomised trial analysis
- Include community trials as well in a sufficient manner. The course almost depended on clinical trials while most students are not clinicians.
- The course should give weights to assumptions to be taken rather than a presentation of many items broken down into pieces.
- Add examples, lectures on community interventions.
- It is better to include public health problems
- Improve the content/revise the content

13. How can we improve the teaching?
- Invite guests who have the competency on the course
- Include seminars on some topics to be presented by students
- Make participatory lectures rather than more of presentations
- Go into randomization techniques and study designs in more detail
- Some of the things were not clear in the slides
- For me it was an excellent way of teaching
- Everyone was excellent as professor in the course. Should it be possible to move some PhD students in the subsequent teachings so that they don't forget what they learnt and apply the knowledge as they prepare for their defence, etc.
- It is very good
- Maybe you can make it more interactive, some of the lectures were like reading from slides
- I will suggest that some (few) parts of the course presented by a student (group of students) just to practice.
- Reduce number/frequency of home assignments
- Give students more articles to read for each concept taught in class
- The overall teaching was very good
- Teaching was good, but for videotaping a mic should be provided for questions from the class. It could not be heard.

14. How can we improve the administration?
- Very nice!!
- Nice
- Good
- Administration was very supportive and very helpful.
- How the exam will take place

15. How can we improve the overall learning experience?
- The afternoon lab sessions could be improved
- Time management, especially the afternoon sessions
- However, MittUiB at times had locked exams
- If few things are given for students to prepare and present
- Question lectures and more time for study
- PhDs should be mandated to teach this when they get back to their countries

- Again make it more participatory
- Work in practical exercises and give more time for that

16. How can we improve the use of group and daily assignments?
- Good
- It is ok but try to assign individuals to group based on their research experiences and the like
- In some home assignments, I perceived there may be some misunderstanding and only little flexibility in the way answers were interpreted and grade
- Give feedback on most common mistakes
- Readings were too much and almost impossible to do on top of the assignments and full days lectures
- Good
- The daily assignment is good, very good even but consider time
- Some group members once they know that the assignment will not add anything on the final exam they don't participate effectively in the group assignments. So don't tell whether it will contribute or not
- Group and daily assignments were very good and well organised
- Group work was very time consuming and also challenging due to language issues. Perhaps one group work or presentation earlier could be good.

17. What do you think should be changed/removed/added in order to make a better course/programme?
- Instead of going through the Stata commands (which could be read) I would find it more useful to go through the interpretation of the results
- I think all the elements of the course are very relevant
- Add other types of trials that may not be related to clinical aspects
- Extend the course to 4 weeks
- More emphasis on the interpretation and meaning of some statistical outputs, even by assignments
- Add statistics more
- Answers of Stata exercises should be uploaded on the MittUiB
- Minimise lecturing too much of broken pieces and concentrate on scientific bases and reasoning so that participants understand more of concepts
- Most of lectures were focused on clinical trials but for who any going to do community intervention?
- Pharma cut/remove
- Avoid repetitions

18. Other comments?
- I am really happy with the course and I have got a lot
- Course arrangement should be modified, especially course material, ppt. It is not well organised and not in order of relevance
- I consider the course was overall very good. It encourages students to develop analytical skills, and abilities to critically appraise RCTs, as well as main principles to design with high quality standards, randomised clinical trials
- Some techno problems with MittUiB
- Making exams open book might help to focus on concepts rather than memorizing
- Course was very useful. Overdose for those without prior trial experience
- The admission purpose was not clear to me

19. Anyone you would like to give extra praise to? Motivate!
- I think Pro Thorkild was exceptionally motivating and clear in his lectures. I enjoyed them immensely.
- All facilitators
- All lecturers => EXCELLENT!
- Excellent team. All of you are amazing.
- The course coordinator! Really was good!
- To course coordinator and all staff who teach experimental epidemiology
- Everybody was excellent – in their teaching and sharing their experience!
- Height exercise, peanut butter exercise were very nice it made it easier
- All the software exercises were very exciting also
- I appreciate Prof Thorkild for presenting most practical aspects