Course analysis template

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

Course code	Course title	Credits
5HI001	Computer Applications in Health Care and Biomedicine (10hp)	10
Semester	**Period**	
1	2	

Course leader	Examiner
Stefano Bonacina	Sabine Koch
Other participating teachers	**Other participating teachers**
Sabine Koch, Vasilis Hervatis	

Number of registered students	Number passed after regular session	Response rate for course survey (%)
36	**33**	**36.11%**
Methods for student influence other than course survey Feedback and comments on the schedule and the agenda, while the course is running.		
How will the results from the course analysis be communicated to students The results from the course analysis will be published on the programme website, as open pages.		

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course

HT21 edition of the course was planned to be composed by 33 in-person sessions of two hours each. However, due to Covid-19 pandemic situation, only the initials 17 sessions have been delivered in-person. HT22 edition was planned and delivered as 35 sessions of two hours each (four of them were online). As companies were still working according to remote style, it was possible to arrange only one study visit and having some gest lecture in person. Then, Instructions about the assignments have been updated/clarified, keeping the required professional language to express technical concepts. More sessions were devoted to the explanations of Unified Modelling Language (UML) class diagrams. More sessions were organized as interactive lectures.

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)

Thirteen (13) out of 36 students have completed the course evaluation survey. Ten have clinical/medical education background, while three have “technical” education background. For each question of the survey, mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation, as a percentage, are presented in Table 1.

In Table 1, the mean value of the answers varies from 3.4 to 4.0, while the standard deviation ranges from 0.5 to 1.1. Finally, the coefficient of variation ranges from 12.6 to 32.5 per cent. From those numbers, it appears that respondents' views are quite heterogeneous.

Table 1. Mean,standard deviation and coefficient of variation for questions of the survey.

#	Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
1	In my view, I have developed valuable expertise/skills during the course.	3.5	0.9	24.8
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	3.4	0.7	19.2
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	3.9	0.5	12.6
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).	3.8	0.8	20.8
5	In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	4.0	0.9	22.8
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	3.4	0.7	19.2
7	This course built on knowledge I had acquired during the programme's previous courses.	3.9	0.9	22.0
8	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	3.7	1.0	27.9
9	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.5	1.1	32.5
	Average	3.7	0.83	22.42

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

The course describes the structure, functionality and use of information systems or computer applications (e.g., medical record systems, clinical decision support systems, consumer health, and telemedicine applications) in health care. Computer applications in heterogeneous settings for Clinical Informatics, Consumer Health Informatics, and Public Health informatics will be considered, also considering interoperability, organizational,

ethical and legal aspects. The course was implemented by 35 sessions of two hours each (four of them were online, as involving international guest lecturers).

Course strengths:

1. Class activities and group works.
2. Guest lectures.
3. Engagement in group work.

Course weaknesses:

1. "Clarity/Length" of Instructions about the assignments (Individual Assignment 1).
2. Time allocated for theoretical aspects (e.g., explanations of UML class diagrams).

4. Other comments

-

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.)

In Table 2, reflections on weaknesses and proposals for changes are presented. Responsible for changes is the course director.

Table 2. Reflections on weaknesses and proposals for changes

#	Topic/short summary	Teacher reflections	Actions for improvement
1	"Clarity/Length" of Instructions about the assignments (Individual Assignment 1).	Instructions include technical concepts (that might not be known at the publication date of the assignment). The suggestion of looking at the glossary of the textbook is hardly followed. No word template is provided, as the structure of the report is a criterion of assessment.	Instructions will be clarified; however, the usage of technical concepts in the text of the assignment is indispensable.
2	Time allocated for theoretical aspects	During lectures, theoretical aspects are given, as requested for second cycle education. While they might appear abstract, thinking to their application to the reality is a good learning exercise.	Structure of the lectures will be updated to harmonize theoretical aspects with real world application.