



Course analysis

After the course has ended, the course leader fills in this template.

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Course code 4HM007 | Course title Introduction course | Credits |
| Semester 1 | Period 28 August – 29 September, 2023 | |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Course leader Carl Savage & Mats Brommels | Examiner Niklas Zethraeus |
| Other participating teachers Henrik Ahlenius, Anna Borgström, Niklas Dennermalm, Birger Forsberg, Gert Helgesson, Fredrik Lindencrona, Rachel Seltzer, Amanda Thorell. | Other participating teachers |

| Number of registered students | Number passed after regular session | Response rate for course survey (%) |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 37 | 2 students dropped out of the program for personal reasons. 18 failed. After revisions, all 35 passed the course. | 73% (27/37) 77% (27/35) |

Methods for student influence other than course survey

In class reflection session in the second week of the course. We had a reflection session after the public health module. We did not do a WW/DD at the end of the course this year.

How will the results from the course analysis be communicated to students

Uploaded into Canvas and posted on the page: Course Improvement.

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course

- While we provided a classic .pdf schedule to students prior to registration and for the open page, we only used the Canvas calendar from the course start.
- We have made more clear the grading of the final individual task so that the parts necessary for passing are considered to be a threshold level, i.e. even if it is well-written, the assignment will not receive a passing grade if the SBAR structure or correct referencing are not followed.
- We made a concerted effort for the final “Town Hall” meeting to become more of a role-play to tease out the differences between the different perspectives.
- We kept the online recorded lectures and worked to ensure that the in-class sessions were interactive.
- Included MF and the Student Ombudsman during the introduction session.



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. Enclose results from the course evaluation)

Average on development of valuable expertise/skills during the course – although, as an introduction course, expertise is not the aim of the course, but rather to provide an overview of the types of questions addressed by the programs different areas. Students felt they achieved the learning outcomes to some extent (37%), our hope is that most would be at a larger or very large extent (59%). If this pattern repeats it would be worth looking into this. A common theme was identified by the students, a scientific approach to thinking and reasoning to a large or very large extent (89%). The teachers were open to ideas and opinions from the students and the demands of the course were reasonable in relation to the learning outcomes. Oral and written communication improved and there was a good atmosphere during the course with time for reflection. Opinions on the course organization were more widely spread across the alternatives, which may reflect on the course start when one of the teachers was absent.

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

Course strengths:

- The OrthoChoice case tied the program's three areas together
- The public health module was mentioned by the students
- The Town Hall worked very well this year – the most interactive and engaging we have ever experienced since the start of the program.
- Pre-recorded lectures and in-class student activating seminars.

Course weaknesses:

- Confusion about group formation and Canvas occurred on the first day because the course leader who usually covers that information (Carl) was laid low with a cold.
- Communication with teachers outside of KI via Canvas.

4. Other comments

- We were considering replacing the prerecorded lectures with face-to-face lectures, but given the feedback (and the pedagogical evidence) to the contrary, it seems to be a better idea to review the lectures to ensure that they are still up-to-date.
- Many emails from students expressing concern about the fails/incompletes in the public health module and the final individual assignment. Linked to different practices in the students' previous education in other countries, where a fail on one assignment would severely impact the students' final grade as there would be no revisions allowed. Would therefore be good to describe the grading practices we have at KI.

5. 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.)



- Review the pre-recorded lectures and the material on the pages to ensure that they are up-to-date (All teachers are responsible for reviewing their sessions)
- Develop an interactive public health seminar tied to Gapminder or similar?
- Keep to the format of prerecorded online lectures and student-activating in-class seminars
- Update the page on grading to explain that students have the ability to revise failed assignments (Carl)
- Improve the instructions for the final individual assignment to make the threshold grading even more clear and provide example of grading table for the thesis. (Carl)
- Ensure that the grading on references are linked to Anna Borgström's sessions on academic writing and plagiarism. (Carl & Anna)
- Include some alumni on the first day as we have done in previous years.
- Don't be sick on the first day 😊