

## Kursanalys (kursutvärdering)

<b>Kurskod</b> 3GB001	<b>Kurstitel</b> Research Methodology	<b>Högskolepoäng</b> 7,5
<b>Termin (vt/ht-år)</b> Ht23	<b>Tidsperiod</b> 2023-08-28—2023-11-05	

<b>Kursansvarig</b> Carina King	<b>Examinator</b> Carina King
<b>Momentansvariga lärare</b> Carina King, Helle Mölsted Alvesson, Francesca Zanni, Mehdi Osooli, Kyla McKay, Marianno Salazar, Helena Hildenwall, Ayobami Bakare, Maria Rosario del Alsina, Katrine de Angeles	<b>Övriga medverkande lärare</b>

<b>Antal registrerade studenter vid treveckorskontrollen</b> 45	<b>Antal godkända vid sista kursdatum</b> 27	<b>Svarsfrekvens kursvärderingsenkät</b> 62%
<b>Övriga metoder för studentinflytande</b> (utöver avslutande kursvärdering) Through out the course, the student representatives provided feedback around student concerns, and there was a Q&A forum where students could post general questions around the course content, schedule and examinations – this was monitored daily by the course leaders.		
<b>Återkoppling av kursvärderingsresultat till studenterna</b> Given we ran the course differently this year, we hope to run a group discussion with students on how this went, reflecting on the feedback they gave, to try and constructively come up with a better approach for next year.		

### Observera att...

Analysen ska (tillsammans med sammanfattande kvantitativ sammanställning av studenternas kursvärdering) delges utbildningsnämnd vid kursgivande institution samt för programkurser även programansvarig nämnd.

Analysen har delgivits utbildningsnämnd följande datum: **6th December 2023**

Analysen har delgivits programansvarig nämnd följande datum: **6th December 2023**

### 1. Beskrivning av eventuellt genomförda förändringar sedan föregående kurstillfälle baserat på tidigare studenters synpunkter

We made a major change in course for 2023, compared to the 2022 course, based on specific suggestions given by the students. The Introduction to GH and the Research Methods course were ran in parallel to each other over a 10 week period, instead of sequentially for 4 and 6 weeks,

respectively. The idea for this shift was to allow students more time to get comfortable with the methods, and learning analysis skills, but also to actively apply content learning from the Introduction course to practical skills in the Methods course. We also changed the examination format, from 3 take home exams for qualitative, epidemiology and biostatistics, to being in-person invigilated exams. This was done due to concerns about students using ChatGPT, but also experiences of plagiarism with the take home format.

## 2. Kortfattad sammanfattning av studenternas värderingar av kursen

*(Baserad på studenternas kvantitativa svar på kursvärderingen och centrala synpunkter ur fritextsvar. Kvantitativ sammanställning och ev. grafer bifogas.)*

Overall, the students gave the course 3.4/5 for developing valuable skills, which is lower than in previous years. The areas where the students gave the lowest scores were around the workload (2.7/5), the design of the course to achieve the intended learning outcomes (3.0/5) and having a common theme from learning outcomes to the examination (3.0/5). From the narrative responses, the reasoning for these lower scores seemed to stem from having the exams for the qualitative component, and the Introduction to GH, scattered during the epi/stats period of teaching, meaning students had to focus on multiple overlapping methods and content simultaneously. In addition, they raised concerns around the structure not feeling cohesive and the biostatistics lectures in particular not covering the same content as was in the exam – with the feeling being that the communication here was poor.

In terms of what the students scored the course well on, the highest score was for promoting a scientific way of thinking (3.9/5), and the teachers being open (3.7/5). The lecturers were also highlighted in the narrative feedback several times as being knowledgeable and generally students gave positive feedback on the style of teaching.

Overall, feedback was conflicting in two key areas, the approach to biostatistics exercises, and the volume of group work/reading in qualitative methods. On the biostatistics, explicit feedback was given that the self-study exercises were a strength, while others suggested that there was not enough structured class time for learning Stata. Similarly for qualitative methods, some students highlighted the group work as something they liked, while others questioned the workload and utility.

## 3. Kursansvarigs reflektioner kring kursens genomförande och resultat

***Kursens styrkor:*** Strengths of the course were the students appreciating the inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative methods, and reflections on how and when they should be used. Example feedback included that the course "encouraged to think critically". The class were generally very engaged when we did group activities, and were clearly keen to learn.

***Kursens svagheter:*** Weaknesses were around the organisation of the schedule, and communication around expectations and examinations. Feedback from students clearly showed frustration in how the exams were done, but also reflect a lack of engagement in the communication given in the lead up to exams. It came across that there was a mismatch in what the course expects can be done in the time, and what a sub-set of students feel is reasonable. The course content for biostatistics has already been streamlined in previous years, and so reducing this any further is not really practical for the learning outcomes.

### 3. Övriga synpunkter

There were a few other issues worth raising for this year's course – firstly that the conduct of the invigilated exams was sub-standard. The students reported that the staff present in the exam rooms

spoke to students during the exam, which was disruptive, and they forgot to bring the calculators for the biostatistics exam – meaning the time had to be extended. This did not reflect well on KI or the course, and the failure rate for this section of the assessment was relatively high. Secondly, the biostatistics lecturer was their first time teaching on the course, and I should have had better communication with them leading up to the course around the level of the students and the pedagogical approach they would take. Finally, the pacing of the exams did not work well with the two courses being integrated. Overall, students only scored the integration of the courses 2.8/5 – with part of this low score being pragmatic issues, like two different schedules which didn't always speak to each other. But more broadly, students reported finding the switch between the two focusses hard, and that there wasn't enough time to digest.

#### **4. Kursansvarigs slutsatser och eventuella förslag till förändringar**

*(Om förändringar föreslås, ange vem som är ansvarig för att genomföra dessa och en tidsplan. )*

Key changes that should be adopted next year include:

- Re-working the exam schedules for the methods and introduction courses, so that the students can "finish" a topic before moving to the next.
- Figuring out how to present a single schedule on TimeEdit for the Introduction and Methods course, so student don't need to jump back and forth between Canvas pages.
- Re-think how group work activities can be part of students examinations, and be used to link the two courses (e.g. can we combine sessions to make the schedule less busy by having joint course group activities)
- Re-visit the biostatistics learning objectives and how the lecture content reflects these and the exam questions to ensure this is made clearer to the students.

The first three points should be done jointly by the Intro and Methods course leaders, and the final point is for the Methods course leader.

#### **Bilagor:**