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	Course title	Credits
5HI019	User Needs, Requirements Engineering, and Evaluation	10 HP
Semester	**Period**	
VT2024	2025-01-20 – 2025-03-23	

Course leader	Examiner
Nadia Davoody	Nadia Davoody
Other participating teachers	**Other participating teachers**
Sabine Koch, Aboozar Eghdam, Anders Thelemyr, Richard Whitehand, Leo Kowalski, Ulf Lesly, Chen His Tsai, Natalia Stathakarou, Jamie Luckahaus	

Number of registered students	Number passed after regular session	Response rate for course survey (%)
41	18	43.90%

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As in previous years, the literature and course materials were updated, and some outdated content was removed. The descriptions of all assignments were revised for greater clarity. Additional ethical aspects were incorporated into the lecture slides and reflected in the exam. Furthermore, the evaluation block was improved by integrating real-life examples into lectures. This year, the grading system was improved, and a description of the grading procedure was added to the assignment page. In addition, students were offered detailed information about the grading breakdown upon request.

Furthermore, additional problem descriptions were introduced, allowing students to work on a wider range of projects.

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.)

18 out of 41 students have completed the course evaluation survey. Fifteen students had a clinical background, and three 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.	3.5	0.5	14.7%
2	In my view, I have achieved all the intended learning outcomes of the course.	3.7	0.7	18.0 %
3	In my view, there was a common theme running throughout the course – from learning outcomes to examinations.	3.9	0.8	19.5 %
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).	3.8	0.9	23.2 %
5	In my view, during the course, the teachers have been open to ideas and opinions about the course's structure and content.	3.9	0.8	20.3 %
6	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	3.6	0.8	22.0 %
7	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	3.3	1.4	41.2 %
8	The course was challenging enough for me.	3.3	1.1	34.4 %
	AVERAGE	**3.6**	**0.9**	**24.16 %**

Students highlighted several aspects they appreciated in the course. Many valued the relevance and practicality of the course content, especially its grounding in real-world examples and healthcare scenarios. The integration of hands-on group projects, where students could simulate design processes and address real-world problems, was particularly well-received. Students also appreciated the breadth of topics covered, which provided a comprehensive understanding of health information system design and evaluation. The opportunity to engage with stakeholders and practical tools, such as prototyping and use-case modeling, enhanced the learning experience. Furthermore, the interactive lectures and the clear course structure helped students stay engaged and motivated. Several students also mentioned that group collaboration and the study visit were highly beneficial for learning.

Despite these strengths, students encountered several challenges. A major concern was the clarity of instructions, particularly regarding the assignments and the take-home exam. The exam format itself received criticism, with some suggesting it was more like an assignment than an exam and preferred shorter alternatives.

Scheduling and workload were also significant issues. Because the course ran in parallel with other courses, students found it difficult to coordinate group work and manage deadlines. Presentation sessions were perceived as too long and tiring. Some students expressed frustration about mandatory attendance policies, especially in cases of illness or family obligations. Lastly, there were suggestions for more practical sessions and more consistency in feedback across different lecturers.

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

Course strengths:
- Practical, real-world application of eHealth design and evaluation concepts
- Well-structured course content with engaging assignments and group work
- Motivating and interactive teaching and study visit

Course weaknesses:
- Unclear or inconsistent instructions for assignments and questions in the exam
- Scheduling conflicts and heavy workload due to concurrent courses
- Long and tiring seminars and presentations

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.)

Unfortunately, this year, the requirement for compensation assignments for missing mandatory sessions caused considerable dissatisfaction among students. In future iterations of the course, these requirements will be communicated more clearly at the beginning. In response to feedback about unclear assignment instructions and exam questions, the course leader will revise and clarify these materials to improve the clarity.

Regarding the heavy workload, students are encouraged to balance their efforts between the two courses, as lectures and assignments for the other course have been scheduled with fewer demands during the first weeks of this course. The course directors of both courses have coordinated to ensure that the combined workload of these parallel courses does not exceed a full-time study commitment.

To address concerns about long and tiring seminar sessions dominated by presentations, the seminar format will be redesigned. Instead of brief presentations followed by instructor feedback, the new seminars will focus on structured peer review. Student groups will actively engage by reviewing each other's projects, participating in discussions, and providing constructive feedback. This new format aims to increase engagement and support interdisciplinary learning. The revised peer review format will transform seminars from passive presentation sessions into interactive, dialogue-driven discussions where students engage directly with one another's work. This approach fosters diverse perspectives and enhances understanding of the course material. Although it demands more interactive time during seminars, the anticipated gains in student engagement, comprehension, and collaborative skills make it a valuable enhancement.