



Course analysis template

After the course has ended, the course leader fills in this template. This is an important part of the quality assurance of the programme. The programme director decides whether the template should be supplemented with further information/questions.

Course code 5HI019	Course title User Needs, Requirements Engineering, and Evaluation	Credits 10 HP
Semester VT2023	Period 2023-01-16- 2022-03-19	

Course leader Nadia Davoody	Examiner Sabine Koch
Other participating teachers Vasilis Hervatis, Sabine Koch, Aboozar Eghdam, Anders Thelemyr, Richard Whitehand	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 37	Number passed after regular session 35	Response rate for course survey (%) 64.86%
Methods for student influence other than course survey The course consists of three moments/blocks. Throughout the whole course the students were asked to provide feedback about the seminars and different parts of the course.		

Note that...

This analysis shall (together with a summary of the quantitative results of the students' course survey) be submitted to the LIME educational committee.

This analysis has been submitted to the LIME educational committee on this date:

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course based on previous students' comments

This year, like in previous years, the teachers in the course helped the groups to handle the conflicts that occurred within the groups. The course leader provided more information regarding the instructions for the group work. The material was updated, and some old materials were removed. For this year, we used an application for the last assignment which was in English. It made it easier for the students to use it without any language problems.

2. A brief summary of the students' evaluations of the course

(Based on the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation and comments. Quantitative compilation and possible graphs attached.)

24 out of 37 students have completed the course evaluation survey. Twenty students had a clinical background and four had a technical background. For each question of the survey, the mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation, as a percentage, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the students' evaluation of the course.

#	Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
1	In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	4.3	0.6	13.0%
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.3	0.6	14.5 %
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	4.3	0.6	14.7 %
4	In my view, the course has promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (e.g., analytical and critical thinking, independent search for and evaluation of information).	4.4	0.6	14.8 %
5	In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.2	0.9	22.0 %
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	4.4	0.8	17.6 %
7	This course was built on knowledge I had acquired during the programme's previous courses.	3.8	0.8	21.3 %
8	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	4.1	0.8	19.0 %
9	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.8	0.8	22.0 %
	AVERAGE	4.2	0.7	17.6 %

The students liked the dynamic lectures, the mix of regular lecturers and guest lecturers, the study visits, and the guidance throughout the course. The teamwork and group assignments were appreciated and were perceived as helpful for achieving the course objectives. The students were even satisfied with the way each assignment was built up on the previous one. The course structure and development of digital prototypes were helpful, and the students believed that the new knowledge and skills introduced during the course were practical and close to industry.

The students, however, were not satisfied with the significant number of materials, especially in the evaluation part of the course. They were also unsatisfied with the lack of lectures about evaluation due to the sickness of one of the teachers. Some students required more clarification regarding the assignments and preferred to form their groups themselves instead of being assigned to different groups. This is, however, not appropriate as some students don't get into any groups. This is based on previous years' experience using the method.



3. The course-responsible reflection on the course implementation and results

Course strengths:

- Overall course structure, interesting topics, dynamic lectures, and discussions during seminars
- Guest lectures and experts from different companies and study visits
- Group works and working with real-life examples and prototypes.

Course weaknesses:

- More lectures in the evaluation block
- Parallel lectures with other courses at SU
- More clarification about the assignment and the exam

3. Other comments

4. The course-responsible conclusions and any proposals for changes

(If any changes are proposed, please specify who is responsible for implementing these and a time schedule.)

Based on the feedback from the students, we will update the evaluation block. Unfortunately, the teacher responsible for the evaluation block got sick during the course and the students missed two lectures. The theme leaders will give more explicit instructions about the assignments and the home exam. Better coordination with course leaders at Stockholm University will be done for the next time the course is given.