



Course analysis

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

Course code 5HI003	Course title Health Care Organization and Management [in the Digital Age]	Credits 7.5
Semester HT 2025	Period 24 Oct 2025 – 27 Nov 2025	

Course leader Natalia Stathakarou	Examiner Sabine Koch
Other participating teachers DY: David Yu, Anaesthesiologist, Karolinska Hospital Huddinge JØ: John Øvretveit, Professor of health care improvement implementation and evaluation, MMC/LIME Karl Hybinette, Researcher and Doctoral student at MMC/LIME, coordinator of patient safety at NICU/KS KS: Kay Sundberg, Assistant professor, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society (NVS), Karolinska Institutet LJH: Lovisa Jäderlund Hagstedt, MD, specialist, deputy head of TioHundra primary care; PhD student at HIC MB: Mats Brommels, Professor of Health Services Management, MMC/LIME MS: Mariano Salazar, PhD, MD, social epidemiologist, Research Coordinator at GPH, KI PH: Patrik Hidefjäll, PhD, affiliated researcher at MMC/LIME Investigator at the National Board of Health and Welfare SKon: Stathis Konstantinidis, Assist. Prof. in e-Learning and Health Informatics, Digital Innovations in Healthcare and Education (DICE) Research Group, University of Nottingham UK SN: Sokratis Nifakos, Health Informatics Center, Karolinska Institutet	Other participating teachers



Number of registered students	Number passed after regular session	Response rate for course survey (%)
19	18	(8 students) 44,4%
Methods for student influence other than course survey		
The course leader asked the students for feedback and suggestions for improvement.		
How will the results from the course analysis be communicated to students		
The results will be sent to the students via the Canvas platform and will be uploaded to the course's webpage.		

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course

The course combined both digital and physical learning activities, since the blended learning approach applied in previous years had been appreciated. Most lectures took place physically on campus; however, the course also included guest lectures from other countries, who presented different healthcare systems and allowed students to understand how these systems differ across contexts. No major changes were implemented compared with the previous course, since the course has been perceived very positively.

As part of the course, students were invited to attend the event Dagar om Lagar (Days of Laws) free of charge, where regulations and updates related to artificial intelligence in healthcare and the European Health Data Space were discussed. The event was organized by SFMI, the Swedish Medical Informatics Association, where the course leader is one of the board members.

As in previous years, the course included a study visit to the hospital, especially to the NICU, which has consistently been well received by students.

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)

#	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.	5,8	0,5	8,1 %
2	I felt included and respected	5,9	0,4	6%

	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).			
3	The course as a whole was good	5,6	0,5	9,2%
4	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	5,9	0,4	6%
5	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	5,5	0,8	13,7%
6	The course was challenging enough for me.	4,2	1,2	27,4%

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

Course strengths:

- The lecturers
- Space to focus on students' areas of interest
- The visit to the hospital
- The conference "Dagar om Lagar"

Course weaknesses:

- The schedule depends on the availability of guest lecturers, which might affect the overall schedule structure and the organization of thematic weeks.

4. Other comments

Overall, the course was appreciated by the students.

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.)



**Karolinska
Institutet**

Course analysis template - Health Informatics

I am not going to conduct any major changes since the course is appreciated by the students.