



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 5HI024	Course title Current Research and Trends in Health Informatics	Credits 15 HP
Semester HT2023	Period 2023-08-28- 2024-01-14	Period 50% during the whole semester

Course leader Nadia Davoody	Examiner Sabine Koch
Other participating teachers Magnus Boman, Natalia Stathakarou, Sindri Magnússon, Stefano Bonacina	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 34	Number passed after regular session 34	Response rate for course survey (%) 58.82%
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, we provided three themes: Participatory Health Informatics, Precision Medicine, and Machine Learning. Theme 1, Participatory Health Informatics, included two sub-themes: Virtual Reality and Standardisation within Health Informatics. Improvements have been made to the assessment criteria and grading scale for the final exam. The assignment descriptions have been revised for clarity, and additional information on seminars has been provided. We continued providing information about the poster session, assignments, seminars, and the final exam during the course.

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.)

20 out of 34 students have completed the course evaluation survey. Eighteen students had a clinical background and two 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.	3.7	0.7	17.8%
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	3.8	0.9	24.3 %
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	3.8	1.0	26.5 %
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).	3.6	1.0	29.1 %
5	In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	3.6	1.1	29.8 %
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	3.8	1.0	27.0 %
7	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	3.8	1.0	25.7 %
8	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.6	0.9	26.6 %
	AVERAGE	3.7	0.9	25.8 %

The students enjoyed the freedom the course provided, particularly in planning and performing their own projects. Positive feedback was given for supervision sessions within some of the themes. In addition, the students highlighted the motivation of some theme leaders contributing to a positive learning environment. The students appreciated being challenged with cutting-edge techniques, providing a unique learning experience. They expressed satisfaction with learning about advanced research at KI and appreciated the experience. In addition, the scoping review was seen as a valuable learning experience that would help write the master thesis.

The students, however, highlighted a lack of communication and coordination between teachers from KI and SU, leading to confusion in following templates and grading criteria. The students mentioned issues with lack of feedback from the theme leader from SU, and conflicting feedback from different supervisors within the theme. The students recommended better coordination, alignment in grading criteria, and clearer communication. In addition, the students were less satisfied with the poster presentation as they believed that it could be more interactive. Some students believed that working in groups was challenging due to unequal



participation, with some students relying on the group leader. In addition, the students were not satisfied with overlapping schedules between different courses.

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

Course strengths:

- Freedom and individualization, the course flexibility that allows students to explore topics of personal interest.
- Effective supervision and support, positive feedback on supervision sessions at KI with helpful and engaged supervisors.
- Real-world applications and cutting-edge techniques, providing students with valuable insights and preparing them for challenges in their future academic and professional careers.

Course weaknesses:

- Communication and coordination challenges, lack of communication and coordination between teachers from different institutions.
- Group work challenges and overlapping schedules between different courses.
- Supervision challenges and many teachers involved in grading assignments and exams in theme 3 at SU.

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 improve the coordination with the theme leader at SU. The course evaluation has already been shared with all theme leaders in the course and necessary improvements will be made for the next time the course is given. The course director has already discussed the issue regarding the inconsistency in grading assignments and exams within theme 3 at SU and has stressed the importance of following the criteria of assessment for all teachers involved in this theme. To address challenges in group work, we plan to provide comprehensive guidance to students, emphasizing the importance of equal contribution from all team members. While efforts were made to coordinate schedules well in advance, unforeseen circumstances, such as the illness of the SU course director, led to overlaps with other courses. We acknowledge this issue and are actively working to prevent similar circumstances in the future.