



## 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.

<b>Course code</b> 5HI024	<b>Course title</b> Current Research and Trends in Health Informatics	<b>Credits</b> 15 HP
<b>Semester</b> HT2025	<b>Period</b> 2025-09-01- 2026-01-18	<b>Period</b> 50% during the whole semester

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

<b>Number of registered students</b> 40	<b>Number passed after regular session</b> 37	<b>Response rate for course survey (%)</b> 37,50%
<b>Methods for student influence other than course survey</b> 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 have been implemented to enhance the course. More information about the grading process has been included in the course page. In addition, the structure of all seminars has been improved as the students found the previous structure to be long and tiring. Theme leaders have been given access to the course evaluation, and a discussion about supervision and guidance across all subjects has taken place. In addition, the assignment templates have been improved for clarity.

## 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.)

15 out of 40 students have completed the course evaluation survey. 13 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	The course was designed in a way that provided me with opportunities for active learning. For example: seminars with discussions, group work, projects, student presentations, role play, peer learning, practical exercises, laboratory work, workplace-based learning, etc.	5.2	1.4	26.40%
2	I felt included and respected during the course. For example: I was comfortable collaborating with other students, speaking in front of the group, answering teachers' questions, and I was listened to (not interrupted, ridiculed, or similar).	5.3	1.4	27.3 %
3	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	5.3	1.2	22.1 %
4	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	4.6	1.5	31.6 %
5	The course was challenging enough for me.	4.8	1.3	26.4 %
	<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>5.04</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>26.76 %</b>

Overall, students describe the course as highly valuable, motivating, and well aligned with thesis preparation. Many experienced it as a “mini-thesis” that helped clarify academic interests, build confidence, and practice core research skills such as literature reviews, database searches, poster presentations, and collaborative work. While the structure, themes, and teaching staff were appreciated, some students noted uneven supervision, group work challenges, and timing/logistical issues, particularly related to parallel courses.

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

### Course strengths:

- *Thesis preparation:* Students deepened their knowledge in self-chosen topics, practiced key research skills such as research design, scoping reviews, and literature searches, and gained greater clarity about their future academic direction. This experience was consistently described as motivating and confidence-building across multiple participants.
- *Engaged and supportive teachers:* Students consistently highlighted the dedication and encouragement shown by the lecturers, as well as the constructive and easy-to-understand feedback they received throughout the course. The guest lectures were described as particularly inspiring and meaningful.
- *Course design and thematic structure:* The use of themes, collaborative group work, poster sessions, and sharing of all posters were widely appreciated. Being placed in a



preferred theme enhanced engagement and learning, and the overall structure was described as clear, interactive, and meaningful.

**Course weaknesses:**

- *Theme selection and shifting:* Some students reported that they needed to learn a substantial amount independently, particularly in relation to model development and coding or other technical components. There was a request for more hands-on supervision and the inclusion of concrete, real-world examples, especially to better support participants without an IT background.
- *Group work challenges and skills imbalances:* some comments pointed to challenges in interdisciplinary group work, including unequal contributions and differing communication styles among group members. In some cases, technical tasks such as coding were largely handled by IT-focused students, which limited opportunities for shared learning and knowledge exchange across disciplinary backgrounds. These imbalances negatively affected collaboration and, for some groups, reduced the overall learning outcome.
- *Course logistics:* Students also reported difficulties related to coordinating assignments while simultaneously participating in parallel.

### 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 course appears to be effective in supporting its core educational aim of preparing students for independent research and thesis work. Student satisfaction is high. However, certain structural and pedagogical adjustments could make the learning experience more supportive for all backgrounds. More information will be provided regarding group works and expectations for shared learning and collaboration. We will extend the deadline for the scoping review by one additional week, as students highlighted concerns about the workload and the time allocated, particularly in relation to the parallel course at SU. In addition, a discussion with the course director of the parallel course at SU, with the aim of either reducing assignments during the scoping review period or extending the deadline will take place.