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 HT2024	**Period** 2024-09-02- 2025-01-19	**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 41	**Number passed after regular session** 23	**Response rate for course survey (%)** 56,10%
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

As in previous years, several updates were implemented to enhance the course. The assessment criteria for Assignment 2 were revised based on feedback from the previous year, and ethical aspects were added to the evaluation criteria. The exam grading process was also reviewed and refined. Additionally, assignment descriptions were updated for greater clarity, and a detailed explanation of how each part contributes to the final grade was included. The template for Assignment 1 was revised, and a new page outlining all seminar descriptions

was created in Canvas. As in previous years, the course lectures were updated by the respective teachers.

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.)

23 out of 41 students have completed the course evaluation survey. 21 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	19.0%
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	3.8	0.9	23.2 %
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	3.8	0.8	21.8 %
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).	4.1	0.7	17.19 %
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	1.0	25.0 %
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	3.9	1.0	25.0 %
7	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	3.8	0.9	24.5 %
8	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.6	0.9	24.7 %
	AVERAGE	**3.8**	**0.9**	**22.55 %**

Students valued the opportunity to work on real-world cases, engage in a scoping review, and create both a scientific report and a poster. The practical application of knowledge was a key highlight. They were also satisfied with the guidance from the theme coordinator, supervisors, and course leader, which helped them stay on track. Regular meetings with theme leaders and constructive feedback were also appreciated.

The flexibility to choose team members with similar interests and working styles enhanced collaboration and the work atmosphere. Being able to select a theme they were passionate about made the course more engaging, fostering deeper learning and motivation.

The course provided students the chance to learn in-depth about specific topics and included seminars for peer and teacher feedback. Additionally, students valued the development of both hard skills, such as conducting scoping reviews, and soft skills, including teamwork, critical thinking, and scientific communication.

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

Course strengths:

- *Practical Experience*: Students gained hands-on experience through real-world cases, scoping reviews, and creating scientific posters, preparing them for future research.
- *Strong Support*: Continuous guidance and constructive feedback from theme leaders and supervisors helped students refine their work and stay on track.
- *Collaboration and Personal Engagement*: The ability to choose topics and team members aligned with personal interests fostered motivation, teamwork, and deeper learning.

Course weaknesses:

- *Theme selection and shifting:* Some students were frustrated by being moved to different themes, feeling that choosing a theme they were passionate about from the start would have improved motivation and engagement.
- *Workload and Time Constraints:* This course is given in parallel with other courses. The fact that several courses run at the same time created challenges in balancing tasks. Students felt the scoping review needed more time, and the long, exhausting take-home exam was difficult to manage alongside other commitments.
- *Inconsistent Supervision and Guidance:* Some students felt the supervision was uneven, with certain theme leaders offering little support or feedback, which impacted the quality of the projects.

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.)

The problem with theme selection can be challenging to tackle due to limited spots in each theme, which sometimes requires assigning students to their second-choice themes. Regarding workload and the time allocated for the scoping review, we have already extended the review period by two weeks compared to previous years. If students manage to find a better balance between this course and their parallel course at SU, they should be able to complete the scoping review on time. Unfortunately, many students tend to start the scoping review later than expected, often prioritizing the parallel course in the beginning. Regarding the inconsistent supervision and guidance, based on student feedback, we will enhance supervision and guidance across all themes by sharing the feedback with the teachers in the course.